National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XVI. NO. 42. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 8, 1856. WHOLE NO. 822.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, 138 *Nassau St., New York,*

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

31 *North Fifth St., Philadelphia.*

Advertisements inserted at $1 per square for the first insertion, and 25 cents for every subsequent one. For advertisements less than a square, 50 cents for each insertion.

Pro-Slavery.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN J. A. JONES, OF GEORGIA, AND L. D. CAMPBELL, OF OHIO.

FAIRIE KNOWE, Geo., Feb. 7, 1856.

SIR: I have been reading your speech on the Kansas-Nebraska bill—House of Representatives, Dec. 14, 1854. One short passage gave me great pleasure. You say: "I have briefly passed over and analyzed this Act. I denounce it as transferring the just powers of the people of the States to the National Executive, already swollen with its enormous powers of Federal patronage and the veto. The transfer is a bitter pill." No doubt of it, and the entire bill, doubtless, is more bitter still. But you were forced to swallow it. It is the sweeter to us because you loathe it. Disgorge it if you dare. Repeal the Fugitive Slave law at your peril. Pitiful, meddling, hectoring fanatic—you dare not do it. The South is aroused; you see it, and you will quail; you will crawl back into your fanatical den, and snarl, and growl, and show your claws, but you dare not strike, and I, for one, am sorry for it. Now mark me—you have got the votes in the House to do it. Refuse Kansas admission into *the* Union, and in ninety days she will be admitted into *a* Union freed from your foul, contaminating connection.

Believe this is [not] intended as a threat to deter you (you are deterred already)—it is sent to you in the hope that if you have one spark of courage, it may fire that spark. 'Tis vain—you will retreat from your lofty boastings faster than your regiment ran from the Mexicans at Buena Vista, when they had to be covered by Southern shields. Respectfully, JOHN A. JONES.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, Feb. 19, 1856.

SIR: Your letter of the 7th inst. could not have caused me to spend one moment of my time, nor one drop of ink in reply, but for the fact that, on inquiry of the courteous members who represent Georgia in this body, I learned that very recently you had the audacity to aspire to the seat in the American Congress occupied by Governor Lumpkin.

The object of your impudence in thus addressing me, a stranger to you, is not well understood. If it was to *offend* me, permit me to say that, without provocation, no *gentleman* would insult me—no *blackguard* can! To which class you may belong, it is not my province to decide: I therefore submit your epistle through the press to the people North and South, believing that their just judgment will assign to you your proper position.

But in doing this, I beg of the Northern reader not to judge the people of Georgia by the standard *you* have thus constructed for *yourself*, because my intercourse, for six years in this Hall, with their representatives, satisfies me that the criterion would be grossly unjust. Georgia is the *fast* State of the South. She has made rapid progress in "physical development." Although she sends here those with whom I cannot agree in all respects in matters of national legislation, still she sends men of high-toned character and true "chivalry." When they disagree with their *peers*, they disagree in that spirit which characterizes the statesman and the gentleman—a spirit which it might be well for you to cultivate.

I ought, however, to consider your letter, in some degree, well-timed. Of late, a portion of the newspaper press in the free States have assailed me because I had the temerity to propose that Mr. Orr, of South Carolina, should preside, *temporarily* only, over this body, while in its unorganized condition, in order to preserve that dignity which becomes an *American* Legislature. It is *possible*, if not probable, that Wm. Lloyd Garrison, of Massachusetts, may, for this cause, have burned me in effigy, as he burned the Constitution of "our country" on the 4th of July, 1854. "Covered by the shield" of distance, *you* may do the same in Georgia whenever you wish to amuse yourself in that way.

When the "pitiful, meddling, hectoring fanatics," North and South, have had their day, and shall have gone down, politically, as they *will* go, "unwept, unhonoured and unsung," I trust I shall be a survivor who will be in his *future* as he has endeavoured to be in his *past*, as well in *private* as in *public* life, a friend of that *Liberty* and of that *Union* which his ancestors in the American Revolution, without regard to "geographical lines," defended upon the field of battle.

Yours, and so forth, LEWIS D. CAMPBELL.

John A. Jones, Esq., "Fairie Knowe," Van Wort, Ga.

From The New York Observer.

THE SPIRIT OF INFIDELITY.

THE Satanic Press is the name which is commonly bestowed upon that portion of the secular press which fears not God nor regards man. There is a paper published in our immediate neighbourhood called the *Anti-Slavery Standard*, which we do not see once in three months; nor so often, unless some one sends us a copy for some special purpose. We remember reading, years ago, an advertisement of a book that stated "this book was written by a man who has been lying in his grave ten years, for his own amusement." Probably the writer meant to say "the book was written for his own amusement by a man who," &c. The publishers of the aforesaid *Standard* may make their paper for their own amusement, for no one besides themselves reads it or hears of it to our knowledge.

We have received a copy, of the 9th inst., and find no less than three separate articles devoted to the abuse of the *Observer*, besides a number of other articles from which we take the following elegant extracts.

Speaking of the Rev. Mr. Wadsworth, of Philadelphia, this *Standard* calls him

"The Atheist who, in the garb of a Christian minister, occupies the pulpit of the Arch street Presbyterian Church."

Speaking of the want of revivals in Boston, this *Standard* says:

"Is it not surprising that, with all the aid afforded by the labours and prayers of those eminent saints, Rev. Nehemiah Adams, D.D., Rev. G. W. Blagden, D.D., Rev. Hubbard Winslow—all most devout believers in the divinity of slavery—the Boston churches are not revived? They should send for the Rev. Dr. Lord to come and help them in their distress. They might, perchance, propitiate the Deity they worship by searching out another Thomas Sims or Anthony Burns and delivering him over to a Southern man-stealer by the aid of the National Government. If a revival did not follow such a sacrifice as that upon the 'evangelical' altar, it would be safe to conclude, we should think, that their God is asleep or gone upon a journey."

Speaking of the American Board of Foreign Missions, this *Standard* says:

"Believing it to be a morally corrupt body, and that its influence is hostile to freedom and a pure Christianity, we could wish that it might never be able to procure another dollar. It is the pet idol, however, of the pro-slavery American Church, and will continue to receive the contributions of those wealthy Pharisees who are constantly crucifying the Son of God afresh in the persons of the crushed and outraged bondmen of the South."

Speaking of the American Tract Society, this *Standard* says:

"The Church of which Mr. Storrs is the Pastor has recently uttered a timely and most emphatic testimony against the criminal delinquency of the Tract Society by refusing any longer to contribute to its funds. We wish we could add that Mr. Beecher's Church had taken the same step. Perhaps we shall be able to do so hereafter."

We might continue these extracts to any extent, and these we have made only for brevity's sake: the venom is more concentrated here, but there are long columns of leaded dulness, through which the same deep and malignant hatred of the religion of the Gospel, the same bitter opposition to good men, and the same infernal spirit of persecution of the institutions of Christian benevolence are displayed in every line. Thus, in speaking of the morning prayer meeting in Boston, this *Standard* says:

"Rev. Dr. Lyman Beecher is one of the most constant attendants, and his emphatic testimony to the spiritual advantage gained by the members of the meeting *simultaneously going without their dinners* was thought of sufficient consequence to be inserted in the annual report."

Such sneers as this cover the pages of this sheet, and reveal the *animus* of its conductors, and of its readers, if it has any. We have referred to it, and made these extracts, for the purpose of asking if anything that defines a *Satanic* press is wanting in these passages. There are some, perhaps, who sometimes are disposed to fear that we are wrong in imputing infidelity to these men, and one of our correspondents, not long since, said he admits that Garrison is a hater of evangelical religion, but he is not willing to associate *Abolitionism* with *Fourierism*, *Owenism*, and such *isms* as are undermining the Gospel. Here we quote from the organ of the American Anti-Slavery Society, published in New York, and we ask any man who reveres, as we do, the character of Dr. Lyman Beecher, and Adams, and Blagden, and Winslow—any man who regards Rev. Mr. Wadsworth as a Christian and not an Atheist—any man who loves the American Board and the American Tract Society—we ask any man who loves God and revivals and prayer meetings, to read these extracts, and answer us if they are not the genuine outgoings of the Satanic press? If these are not the exhibitions of a heart that is opposed to God and the gospel of his Son, to his ministers, and to the work of his Spirit, then we know not what the Bible requires, and have altogether mistaken its purport and aims.

It is as plainly a duty to rebuke and condemn such principles and such a spirit as these extracts display as it is to rebuke the abounding wickedness of the land and age. The paper that utters these sentiments is the organ of a great institution, that meditates and attempts the destruction of the American *Union*, and the American *Church*,, and the American *Board*, and the American *Tract Society*, and the American *Bible Society*, and the American *Sunday School Union*, and everything else that is both *American* and *Christian!* And every right-minded man in this country will unite with us in saying, "May my right hand forget her cunning, and my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth," when I cease to resist such an accursed spirit, or to uphold the principles of God's eternal truth, which these enemies of all righteousness are aiming to overthrow. The great battle of the age is between the friends and the foes of the Bible—the whole Bible. The men who love it and drink deeply of its spirit, and humbly submit to its teachings without setting up their philosophy, or philanthrophy, or reason, against its precepts, permissions, or examples, are on our side in this conflict. God is with us. And who are they, and who cares who are they, that be against us?

Selections.

RIGHT AND WRONG IN KANSAS.

PLAIN TALK TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE.

SPEECH OF HON. HENRY WILSON, OF MASSACHUSETTS,

In the Senate, February 19, 1856.

[Not being able to find room for the whole of Mr. Wilson's masterly exposition of the Kansas Question, we have omitted the parts thereof which could best be spared.—EDS. STANDARD.]

SENATOR TOUCEY—THE FACTS.

MR. WILSON—Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Toucey] closes his speech with the assumption that there may be those in the country who do not wish the President to preserve order; and he is pleased to say that, if the Executive does so, their "vocation" will be gone. Let me say to the Senator from Connecticut that the "vocation" of those to whom he alludes is not fawning, abject servility to power. No, sir; they do not

——"bend to power, and lap its milk."

If the Senator from Connecticut alludes to those who have opposed the uncalled-for and wanton repeal of the Missouri prohibition—if he alludes to those who condemn the policy of the Administration in Kansas—if he intends to charge the intelligent, patriotic men who sympathize with the wronged and outraged people of Kansas, now bravely struggling to preserve their firesides, and altars, their property and lives, against the armed aggression of lawless invasions from Missouri, with a disposition to violate or resist the laws of the country, or to cherish sectional animosity and strife, he makes a charge unsupported by even the shadow of truth; and here, and now to his face, and before the Senate and the country, I pronounce the charge utterly unfounded. If he intends, sir, to insinuate a charge of that character against me, I promptly meet it, and, here and now before the Senate, I brand it as it deserves.

The Senator from Connecticut, with an air of confident assurance, calls for facts. Evidently possessed with the vast knowledge embodied in these documents sent here by the Executive, the Senator assumes the air and tone of one entitled to speak by authority, and he invites us to deal in facts. Sir, he shall have facts; for it so happens that the friends of those who are struggling in Kansas to protect their lives, their property, their all, against unauthorized power and lawless violence, know something of the facts which have transpired there. All knowledge, sir, of affairs in Kansas is not in the keeping of the Executive and his Senator from Connecticut.

The Senator from Connecticut commends us to the consideration of this correspondence; and the Senator from California (Mr. Weller) asks us to print ten thousand extra copies, to be scattered broadcast over the land. I now say—and I can establish what I say before any committee of investigation, so that no man can question the declaration—that this correspondence utterly and totally misstates and misrepresents the state of affairs in Kansas. These documents, sir, are made up of telegraphic despatches, of letters, of statements, of orders, written by Governor Shannon and others, on the rumours of the hour in a large Territory, at a time when the people were deeply agitated by all sorts of reports that flew over the land in rapid succession.

We are called upon now to publish these rumours—rumours that turned out to be exaggerated or false—rumours recognised and admitted to be false by the Governor of the Territory in his conversation, and in his treaty with the citizens of Lawrence. Yes, sir, the Senate is now called upon to print and send over the country, as official documents, these stupendous misrepresentations of facts. They will carry a gigantic falsehood to the American people. He who reads only these documents has no accurate knowledge, no true conception of the actual condition of affairs in Kansas at the time covered by them.

EMIGRANT AID SOCIETIES.

Sir, the honourable Senator from Missouri [Mr. Geyer], in his remarks, the other day, upon the resolution of inquiry submitted by me, made the extraordinary declaration that the "disorders" which he admits have existed on the borders "are to be attributed to an extraordinary organization called an 'Emigrant Aid Society'—the first attempt, in the history of this country, to take possession of an organized Territory, and exclude from it the inhabitants of other portions of the Union." I am amazed that the Senator from Missouri should make such a declaration on the floor of the Senate. When and how did the "Emigrant Aid Society" "attempt to take possession of an organized Territory, and to exclude from it the inhabitants of other portions of the Union"?

Will the Senator tell us when that "attempt" was made? Will he tell us where it was made? Will he tell us how it was made? Here and now I challenge the Senator to give us one single fact to sustain the declaration he has so unjustly made against men of stainless purity. The Senator avows that men from his State "have passed over the borders," but they have done so (he tells us) "to protect the ballot-boxes from the attempt of armed colonists to control the elections there." When and how were the ballot-boxes assailed by "armed colonists from the North? I call upon the Senator from Missouri, I challenge any Senator to furnish one fact, one single authenticated fact, to sustain this assumption.

Sir, the Emigrant Aid Society of New England has violated no law, human or divine. Standing here, sir, before the Senate and the country, I challenge the Senator from Missouri, or any other Senator, to furnish to the Senate one fact, one authenticated fact, to show that the Emigrant Aid Society has performed any illegal act, any act inconsistent with the obligations of patriotism, morality, or religion. Sir, the President of the United States has arraigned before the country these Emigrant Aid Societies. The organs of the Administration have assailed them, and now the Senator from Missouri, here, on the floor of the Senate, renews the assault. Sir, I call upon, I defy, any supporter of the Administration, any apologist of Atchison, Stringfellow and their followers, to give us one act of the directors of the New England Emigrant Aid Society hostile to law, order and peace. I know most of these gentlemen thus wantonly assailed, and I know them to be law-abiding, order-loving, conservative men.

I defy the Senator from Missouri, the Senator from Connecticut, or the chief magistrate at the other end of the avenue, to show, here or elsewhere, that the Emigrant Aid Society ever violated a law of this country, or performed an act which could not receive the sanction of the laws of God and man. Sir, they have sent no paupers or criminals to Kansas. They have simply organized a system by which persons wishing to go to Kansas may go in small companies, and, by going together and starting at a particular time and place, may have the cost of their fare reduced about thirty-three per cent. This company has built a hotel in Kansas, has sent some saw-mills there, has aided in establishing schools and churches. That is the extent of their offence—no more, no less.

Sir, the gentleman from Connecticut wishes to know why the seats of the legislators elected by the Missourians were not contested. I will tell him: Mr. Phillips, a young lawyer of Leavenworth, not himself a candidate, took measures to have the seat of the member from the sixteenth district contested—and what was the result? He was taken over into Missouri and lynched, because he dared, simply on patriotic grounds, to dispute the right of the member to his seat, into which he had been voted by these armed men from Missouri.

BORDER RUFFIANS PROTECTING THE BALLOT-BOXES.

The character of this invasion will appear in an extract from a speech made by one of these modern heroes (Gen. Stringfellow), who, according to the Senator from Missouri, crossed over into Kansas "to protect the ballot-boxes from the armed colonists" from the free States. This speech was made just before the election of November 20, 1854, to which the Senator from Connecticut has referred, with so much confidence, at St. Joseph, Missouri. In that speech Gen. Stringfellow said:

"I tell you to mark every scoundrel among you that is the least tainted with free-soilism or abolitionism, and *exterminate* him. Neither give nor take quarters from the damned rascals. I propose to mark them in this house, and on the present occasion, so that you may CRUSH THEM OUT."

"Crush them out"! is the language. You will remember, sir, that the Attorney-General of the United States—a man who spent the dew of his youth and the vigour of his early manhood in assailing democratic statesmen, and who is now giving the mature years of his life to undermining and perverting democratic principles—sent an edict to Massachusetts, pending the election in 1853, that the President "was up to the occasion," and intended to "crush out the element of abolitionism." Gen. Stringfellow, like the President, is "up to the occasion." He has caught up the word of the Attorney-General. He is going to mark the Free-Soilers, he says, that you may "crush them out." I think his success, sir, will be about equal to the success which followed the efforts of the President and General Cushing in "crushing out the element of abolitionism." The elections of the last two years have shown who is the crusher and who is the crushed. Gen. Stringfellow continues:

"To those who have qualms of conscience as to violating laws, State or National, the time has come when such impositions must be disregarded, as your rights and property are in danger; *and I advise you, one and all, to enter every election district in Kansas, in defiance of Reeder and his vile myrmidons, and vote at the point of the bowie-knife and revolver.* Neither give nor take quarters [illegible] that the slaveholding interest wills it, from which there is no appeal. What right has Governor Reeder to rule Missourians in Kansas? His proclamation and prescribed oath must be repudiated. It is your interest to do so. Mind that slavery is established where it is not prohibited."

"Qualms of conscience as to violating laws, State or National"! No, sir; that will never do! "Such impositions must be disregarded"! "Every election district in Kansas must be entered by one and all," and they must "vote at the point of the bowie-knife and revolver"! Is that the way these border gentlemen pass over the line, according to the Senator from Missouri, "to protect the ballot-boxes against the armed colonists"?

"Qualms of conscience about violating laws, State or National," were given up, and they "entered into every election district in Kansas, in spite of the proclamation of Reeder," and made the election of Whitfield doubly sure. The Senate will remember that the Senator from Missouri assures us that Missourians only crossed the borders to "protect the ballot-boxes against the armed colonists" from the East.

Sir, I commend to the special consideration of the Senator from Missouri the advice of Gen. Stringfellow, to give up all "qualms of conscience as to violating laws, State or National," and to "enter every election district in Kansas." Is that the way Missourians "protect the ballot-boxes over the borders"?

The census of Kansas was taken, by the direction of Governor Reeder, in February, 1855, and then there were eight thousand five hundred inhabitants, and two thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven legal voters in the Territory. At the ensuing election—on the 30th of March, 1855—four thousand voters from the State of Missouri passed into that Territory and gave their votes. Lawrence, according to the census, was entitled to less than five hundred votes. But, sir, nine hundred and fifty were cast, although nearly one-half the legal voters of Lawrence, if we are to believe the testimony of some of their most respectable citizens, refused to vote on that day. More than eight hundred Missourians, armed to the teeth, led by Col. Young, a lawyer of Western Missouri, went to Lawrence, the home of the New England men so often assailed and so much misrepresented in documents before us. Col. Young made a speech, declaring that he would vote or would shed his blood. He took the precaution, however, to swear in his vote. He had more regard for his life than he had for his conscience.

Mr. President, I state what I have said on the authority of Mr. Hutchinson, a lawyer of Lawrence, and a rejected Free State member of the Legislature of Kansas, elected in 1855, and now present in the Senate Chamber—a man, sir, of intelligence, of conscience, and of character. And what he says is confirmed by the memorial of Gen. Pomeroy, to which I have referred, setting forth certain facts which transpired on that day. I will read what this gentleman says in regard to the Lawrence district:

"In the Lawrence district, speeches were made to them by leading residents of Missouri, in which it was said that they would carry their purpose, if need be, at the point of the bayonet and bowie-knife, and one voter was fired at as he was driven from the election ground. Finding they had a greater force than was necessary for that poll, some two hundred men were drafted from the number and sent off, under their proper officers, to another district, after which they still polled from this camp over seven hundred votes."

Gen. Pomeroy says that, in the fourth and seventh districts, along the Santa Fé road,

"The invaders came together in one armed and organized body, with trains of fifty wagons, besides horsemen; and, the night before election, pitched their camp in the vicinity of the polls; and having appointed their own judges in place of those who, from intimidation or otherwise, failed to attend, they voted without any proof of residence. In these two election districts, where the census shows one hundred voters, there were polled three hundred and fourteen votes."

In the Leavenworth district, hundreds of men breakfasted in Missouri, voted in Kansas, and returned on the same day to Missouri. While the voting was going on, one of their leaders made a speech, in which he told the Platte County boys that they must stand aside and let the Clay County boys vote first, because they had the furthest to go in returning to their homes; and the Platte County boys of Missouri stood aside and allowed the Clay County boys of Missouri to vote first and go home.

This memorial declares that

"Hundreds of men came together in the sixteenth district, crossing the river from Missouri the day before election, and, encamping together, armed and provisioned, made the fiercest threats against the lives of the judges, and, during the night, called several times at the house of one of them for the purpose of intimidating him, declaring, in the presence of his wife, that a rope had been prepared to hang him; and although we are not prepared to say that these threats would have been carried out, yet they served to produce his resignation, and give these invaders, in the substitution, control of the polls; and on the morning of the election, a steamboat brought from the town of Weston, Missouri, to Leavenworth, an accession to their number of several hundred more, who returned in the same boat, after depositing their votes. There were over nine hundred and fifty votes polled, besides from one hundred to one hundred and fifty actual residents who were deterred or discouraged from voting, while the census returns show but three hundred and eighty-five votes in the district a month before. Not less than six hundred votes were here given by these non-residents of the Territory, who voted without being sworn as to their qualifications, and, immediately after the election, returned back to Missouri, some of them being the incumbents of important offices there."

I will now, sir, quote what Gen. Pomeroy says of the election in the eighteenth district; and I ask the attention of the Senator from Missouri to this statement:

"In the eighteenth election district, where the population was sparse, and no great amount of foreign votes was needed to overpower it, a detachment from Missouri, from sixty to one hundred, passed in with a train of wagons, arms and ammunition, making their camp, the night before the election, near Moorestown, the place of the polls, without even a pretext of residence, and returning immediately to Missouri after their work was done, their leader and captain being a distinguished citizen of Missouri, but late the presiding officer of the Senate of the United States, and who had bowie-knife and revolver belted around him, apparently ready to shed the blood of any man who refused to be enslaved. All these facts we are prepared to establish, if necessary, by proof that would be considered competent in a court of justice."

Gen. Pomeroy expresses the opinion

"That not less than three thousand votes were given by these armed invaders, who came organized in bands, with officers, and arms, and tents, and provisions, and munitions of war, as though they were marching upon a foreign foe, instead of their own unoffending fellow-citizens. Upon the principal road leading into our Territory, and passing several important polls, they numbered not less than twelve hundred men, and one camp alone contained not less than six hundred. They arrived at their several destinations the night before the election, and, having pitched their camps and placed their sentries, waited for the coming day. Baggage-wagons were there, with arms and ammunition enough for a protracted fight, and among them two brass field-pieces, ready charged. They came with drums beating and flags flying, and their leaders were of the most prominent and conspicuous men of their State."

How very considerate it was, Mr. President, in these "prominent and conspicuous men," with their baggage-wagons, and cannons, and rifles, and drums, and flying flags, to lead the men of western Missouri over into the forests and praries of Kansas, to protect the ballot-boxes from those dangerous men, the armed colonists of New England!

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE ADMINISTRATION.

Sir, the whole power and patronage of this Government, from the time when the Kansas and Nebraska act went into operation to this hour, has been given to crush out the free men of Kansas, and to plant the institution of slavery upon that virgin soil. Read the papers which support the Administration in that Territory, and what do we find? The *Squatter Sovereign* says:

"We hope the Thirty-Fourth Congress will be the last Congress that will ever assemble, and that the Southern men coming into Kansas will be prepared to range Kansas in the Southern Republic."

The paper which made that declaration receives the patronage and support of this law-abiding, liberty-loving, Union-saving Administration, which the Senator from Connecticut is always the most prompt, the first—and about the only—Senator here to support (laughter).

Sir, I have before me an extract from another of those Union-loving, law-abiding organs of the Administration in Kansas, which supports the law and order party there, of which we read so much in the correspondence before us. The *Kickapoo Pioneer*, a paper sustained by the friends of the Administration, gives us the following fine specimen of its regard for law and order:

"The South must be up and doing; Kansas must and shall be a slave State. Mark what we say, Southern freemen! Come along with your negroes, and plough up every inch of ground that is at this time disgraced and defaced by an Abolition plough. Send the scoundrels back to whence they came, or send them to hell—it matters not which destination; suit your own convenience. Sound the bugle of war over the length and breadth of the land, and leave not an Abolitionist in the Territory to relate their treacherous and contaminating deeds. Strike your piercing rifle balls and your glittering steel to their black and poisonous hearts; let the war-cry never cease in Kansas again until our Territory is divested of the last vestige of Abolitionism."

The paper which utters such sentiments is the supporter of the President, and the organ and supporter of the policy which meets so warmly the approbation of the Senator from Connecticut.

The officers of the United States in the Territory of Kansas—the Judges, the District-Attorney, the Secretary and the Marshal—are all slave State men, and their influence has been given in favour of making Kansas a slave State. Gov. Reeder, who undertook to protect the people in the exercise of their rights, was stricken down under the pretence that he had been speculating in the public lands. Of about twenty officers of the Federal Government in the Territory, nineteen are slave State men, and one is a free State man; but already he is marked by Atchison, and another designated for his place. Within the last ten days, men from Kansas have called upon the Executive to remonstrate against this striking down of a public officer, simply for the crime of being in favour of free institutions.

WHY GOV. REEDER DID NOT REFUSE CERTIFICATES.

When I yielded the floor yesterday for an adjournment, I was speaking of the election of the 30th of March, 1855. The result of that election was, that the nineteen districts in Kansas were carried by the pro-slavery party, and that more than six thousand votes were given in that Territory, where, thirty days before, there were less than three thousand voters.

The question was put yesterday by the honourable Senator from Connecticut, why the Governor gave certificates of election on that occasion? I will simply say, that Governor Reeder, in the cases brought before him, did refuse to deliver the certificates; that he made the refusal in the presence of the men who claimed them, with bowie-knives and revolvers in their belts, and amidst threats of his life; and while he read the statement, he held a cocked revolver in his hand for necessary self-defence. There were a few devoted friends around him, expecting to see him murdered on that occasion.

In the cases not at the time contested—in the cases where, at the time, no one dared to raise a question—in the cases where, at the time, a contest was neglected—the certificates were given. A new election was ordered in those cases where the certificates were set aside, and, in pursuance thereof, the people elected representatives and councillors, and commissions were issued to them. They met on the 2d day of July, at Pawnee, and both branches of the Legislature, without examining the facts, and positively refusing to do so, voted out the men chosen by the people of Kansas, and voted in the men originally chosen by the Missouri invaders. This Legislature, thus chosen, moved the place of meeting from Pawnee to Shawnee Mission, against the consent of the Governor, who refused afterwards to recognise it as a Legislature. They went on and passed the laws which are now brought here. Some of those laws are as inhuman as any code ever presented for the government of a conquered people.

ATROCIOUS LAWS—PRESIDENT PIERCE AND HIS FRIENDS ANSWERED OUT OF THEIR OWN MOUTHS.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate, and of the country, to some of these laws, forced upon the people who were allured to Kansas by the assurance that they were empowered to shape their own institutions. Here is a precious enactment:

"If any person shall print, write, introduce into, or publish, or circulate, or cause to be brought into, printed, written, published or circulated, or shall knowingly aid or assist in bringing into, printing, publishing or circulating within this Territory, any book, paper, pamphlet, magazine, handbill or circular, containing any statements, arguments, opinion, sentiment, doctrine, advice or inuendo, calculated to produce a disorderly, dangerous or rebellious disaffection among the slaves in this Territory, or to induce such slaves to escape from the service of their masters, or to resist their authority, shall be guilty of a felony, and be punished by imprisonment, at hard labour, for a term not less than five years."

This law, thus enacted, is the law that is to be executed in Kansas, if need be, by the sabres of the United States cavalry. If the men from the free States in that Territory should print or circulate this sentiment uttered by the President of the United States, on the 1st day of January, 1851, in the Constitutional Convention of New Hampshire—

"I would take the ground of the non-extension of slavery, that slavery should not become stronger." "What one thing is there connected with slavery that is not obnoxious?"—

I say that, if these avowals were circulated in that Territory, the person circulating them might be denounced as circulating a speech that was calculated to excite disaffection among men held in bondage.

If a slaveholder should find in the hand of some one of his bondmen, who may have been taught, in spite of legal prohibitions, to read the ten commandments, the pregnant question of the Chief Magistrate of the Republic, "What one thing is there connected with slavery that is not obnoxious?" would he not think it at least a dangerous "inuendo," calculated to create "disaffection" in the bosom of his slave? And, sir, if, in his wrath, he should make the discovery that a son of the Granite State had "caused to be circulated" this sentiment of the prominent son of his native New Hampshire, would he not try the virtues to be found in the term of five years' imprisonment? If some slaveholder should find in the hand of his fleeing bondman the speech of the Attorney-General of the United States, delivered in June, 1836, against the admission of Arkansas with a Constitution making slavery perpetual, wherein I find these sentiments: "I do not persuade myself that liberty is an evil, or slavery a blessing"; "Shall we be brutishly dumb when it is sought through us to render slavery perpetual in the new States?" "I should be false to all the opinions and principles of my life if I did not promptly return a peremptory and emphatic No, when called upon to accord my sanction to a form of government which perpetuates slavery"; would not the slaveholder deem it "a fixed fact" that the man who circulated these sentiments was "guilty of a felony," punishable with five years of imprisonment? Ay, sir, if some son of Massachusetts should be found circulating the resolution of the Democratic State Convention, in 1849, written by Benjamin F. Hallett, the chairman of the National Democratic Committee, and now the President's District Attorney for Massachusetts, declaring that "we are opposed to slavery in every form and colour and in favour of freedom and free soil wherever man lives throughout God's heritage"—a pretty broad declaration, that includes Kansas—I say, that if these resolutions, endorsed by Charles G. Greene, the especial favourite of the President in New England, as National Democratic doctrine, should be circulated in Kansas by some son of Massachusetts, he would be subjected to the punishment provided for in this section.

Here, sir, is another act of this inhuman statute:

"If any free person, by speaking or writing, assert or maintain that persons have not the right to hold slaves in this Territory, or shall introduce into this Territory, print, publish, write, circulate, or cause to be introduced into this Territory, written, printed, published or circulated in this Territory, any book, paper, magazine, pamphlet or circular containing any denial of the right of persons to hold slaves in this Territory, such person shall be deemed guilty of felony, and punished by imprisonment at hard labour for a term of not less than two years."

Here is a law which punishes any freeman as a felon who went into that Territory under your organic law—under your "squatter sovereignty" doctrine—with two years' imprisonment, if he shall circulate any paper that shall "deny the right of any person to hold slaves in the Territory under these laws"; and this is the law which the President of the United States is so anxious to enforce; and this is the law which the Senator from Connecticut congratulates the country is to be enforced!

And, sir, if any person shall be arrested by Governor Shannon for circulating in Kansas any papers denying the right of any person to hold slaves there, this code provides that

"No person who is conscientiously opposed to holding slaves, or who does not admit the right to hold slaves in this Territory, shall sit as a juror on the trial of any prosecution for any violation of any of the sections of this act."

THE FREE STATE MOVEMENT—EXAMPLE OF MICHIGAN.

When the Legislature assembled, when it turned out the men who had been legally chosen, when it brought in the men imposed on the Territory by armed invaders from a neighbouring State, when it removed to the Shawnee Mission, when it was repudiated by your Governor sent there by this Administration, then it was that the freemen of Kansas assembled in their primary meetings, and declared against the legality of the Legislature and its acts. A Convention of the people was called. That Convention assembled, framed a Constitution, the people ratified it, and that Constitution is now submitted for the action of the Congress of the United States. The Senator from Connecticut denounces it as a "spurious Convention." Sir, this Convention was the act of the people of Kansas in their sovereign primary capacity. They accepted the doctrine of squatter sovereignty. They accepted the doctrines laid down by Madison, by Marshall, by Story, by Judge Wilson, by Buchanan and Wright, and the chiefs of the Democratic party in the days when the Democratic party paid some little regard to the principles of popular government.

Sir, the Senator from Connecticut denounced this act of the people as a "spurious Convention." In 1836, the freemen of Michigan, disregarding the action of their Legislature, came together in their primary capacity, framed a Constitution, sent that Constitution to Congress, and that Constitution was carried through the Senate by the votes of Benton, Buchanan, Wright, and the chiefs of the Democratic party; but that was in the days of Andrew Jackson, when it was supposed the people of this country had retained the rights guaranteed to them by the fundamental laws of the country. Sir, Andrew Jackson did not denounce the movement as an insurrectionary one, although they refused to receive the officer whom he sent to them. The Congress of that day did not denounce those men as traitors to the country, as the men of Kansas are denounced in the documents before us, ten thousand extra copies of which we are asked to publish. No, sir, no! This is the first time in the history of this country when the people have assembled in their primary capacity, and exercised their right, their inborn natural right, to change their government at their pleasure, and then been held up as traitors by the Government of the country.

Sir, the Democracy in both branches of Congress sustained the doctrines maintained by the suffrage party in Rhode Island; and it so happens that when Governor Dorr took refuge in the old Granite State, among the first who recognised the doctrines which he maintained was the man who is Chief Magistrate of the United States, and who now denounces the freemen of Kansas, and holds up to the country, as violators of the law, men who are, on the 4th of March next, to be arrested if they dare assemble in their legislative capacity and choose two United States Senators to come and implore us to receive Kansas into this sisterhood of States, and thus save this fair Territory from bloodshed and ruin.

INCAPACITY AND CRIMINALITY OF GOV. SHANNON.

This Administration has now clothed Wilson Shannon—whose incompetency has been made manifest to the world—with civil and military authority, and with all the power of the Government to execute the laws, and to maintain order in the Territory. The duties assigned this officer, in the present critical condition of affairs on your frontiers, are of the gravest and most weighty character. Sir, your Administration—by the wanton repeal of the Missouri prohibition, by the failure to protect the actual residents of Kansas in their rights, and by the blundering acts and criminal remissness of the official authorities—has brought the nation to the perilous edge of civil strife. Sir, this Administration owes it to the country, whose peace is in danger this day, to intrust the responsible and delicate duties of Governor of Kansas to a prudent, judicious, sagacious statesman—a man of individual honour and personal character, in whom the people can place the fullest confidence.

Wilson Shannon is not that man. The man who could descend to degrading companionship around the gaming-tables of those saloons of San Francisco (described by that experienced traveller, Madame Ida Pfeiffer, as the most dissolute she had ever seen in her tour of the globe), with Mexican greasers, the escaped convicts of the British penal Colonies, and the desperadoes of the Old World and the New—the man who could, while Kansas was overrun by armed bands, summoned around Lawrence by his own reckless letters, despatches and proclamations, while civil war lowered over the people entrusted to his care—while an honoured citizen, stricken down by the assassin, lay cold in death, and a devoted wife was weeping over his mortal remains, make himself the humiliating object of the derision of his enemies, and of the pity of his friends, by an exhibition of gross intoxication—is not the man to whom the American people would entrust the affairs of Kansas.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROCLAMATION.

The Senator from Connecticut flatters himself that those of us who do not approve the course of the Administration will be greatly disappointed to find that the leaders of the Free State movement in Kansas have implored the Executive to issue his proclamation. Let not the Senator from Connecticut lay the flattering unction to his soul that we are chagrined by the disclosure of this correspondence. Robinson and Lane, in behalf of the imperilled people of Kansas, asked the President to issue "his proclamation immediately, forbidding the invasion, which, if carried out as planned, will stand forth without a parallel in the world's history." They did not ask the President for his proclamation against the wronged and oppressed people of Kansas. They asked for bread—the President gave them a stone. They asked for a fish—the President gave them a serpent.

The President, sir, has issued his proclamation, but that proclamation is chiefly and mainly directed against Lane and Robinson and the liberty-loving, law-abiding Free State men of Kansas. Like his annual message, in which he softly spoke of the long series of outrages you can scarcely find paralleled in the history of Christian States, as "irregularities"—like that special message in which the aggressive acts of the Missouri invaders were covered over with mild and honeyed phrases, and the defensive measures of the actual settlers treated as insurrectionary acts demanding executive censure, this proclamation will be received on the western borders by the men who, by their votes and by their resolves, have dictated law to Kansas, with shouts of approval. Sir, this proclamation will carry no terror into the Blue lodges and secret clubs of Western Missouri.

But, sir, we were congratulated yesterday, by the Senator from Connecticut, that the laws were to be executed and order preserved. I call the attention of the Senate and of the country to the way in which the laws are to be executed and order preserved, according to the order of the Secretary of War. What does this order say to Colonel Sumner? Does it clearly and expressly command him to arrest, at all hazards, any aggressive movement upon Kansas from Missouri? The Secretary of War informs Colonel Sumner that

"The President has, by proclamation, warned all persons combined for *insurrection or invasive aggression* against the organized Government of the Territory of Kansas, or associated to resist the due execution of the laws therein, to abstain from such revolutionary and lawless proceedings."

Does the Secretary then direct Colonel Sumner to defend Kansas against "invasive aggression"? No, sir, no! His orders are in these terms:

"If, therefore, the Governor of the Territory, finding the ordinary course of judicial proceeding and the powers vested in the United States Marshals inadequate for the suppression of *insurrectionary combinations or armed resistance to the execution of the law*, should make requisition upon you to furnish a military force to aid him in the performance of that official duty, you are hereby directed to employ for that purpose the forces under your command."

Sir, this is not a direction to Colonel Sumner to use his forces against the armed Missouri invaders. The Secretary tells the Colonel that the President has sent out his proclamation against those movements; but when he comes to direct the commander of the forces of the United States what to do, he does not order him to use that force if there shall be an invasion from the State of Missouri. The Secretary shrinks from putting himself against the lawless men who represent a power in this country that sustains them in their aggressive acts. Sir, the Secretary bends to that power; he bows to these men, who have no "qualms of conscience as to violating laws, State or National": and we have had nothing but bows to these men for the last eighteen months from the other end of the avenue.

The reason why the

Court of Appeals having decided that, by the laws of that State, they continued to be slaves, that decision was, in his opinion, conclusive."

This same doctrine is also fully maintained by the Supreme Court of the United States *vs.* The Ship Garonne, 11 Peters' Reports, 73. The facts of the case were, that Mrs. Smith, a widow lady of Louisiana, had visited France, and had taken with her the slave Priscilla. Afterward she was brought back by the son-in-law of Mrs. Smith, and lived in Louisiana as his slave.

Chief Justice Taney, in delivering the opinion of the Court, held: That even assuming by the French laws that Priscilla was entitled to her freedom, upon her introduction into that country, the Court was of opinion that there was nothing in the Act of Congress to prevent her mistress from bringing her back to her place of residence and continuing to hold her as before in her service; and that although the girl had been staying for a time in France, in the service of her mistress, yet in contemplation of law, she still continued an inhabitant of Louisiana.

To return to the question: When brought within the State of Ohio for a temporary purpose by the consent of the master, did they become free in consequence of the clause of the Constitution of Ohio, which declares "There shall be no slavery or involuntary servitude within her limits"? We think not; the true effect of that clause being to prevent slavery as an institution within her limits, rather than to execute the act of manumission upon foreign slaves temporarily upon our soil with the master's consent.

Supposing that Ohio has the right, under her Constitution, to pass laws making the slave free the moment he stands upon Ohio soil by the consent of the master, it is sufficient for the purpose of this case that, at the time Mary Garner and Simon Garner were in the State of Ohio as alleged, there was no law declaring that the relations they held to their master as slaves were dissolved and at an end.

Had they refused to return to Kentucky, it is quite possible that the owner would have invoked the aid of legal process to compel their return in vain. The Federal Courts could not have remanded them to the custody and control of their master, because they were present in Ohio by act of the master, and not as fugitives who had escaped into Ohio. The Constitution and laws of the United States, all-powerful as they are, and I trust always will be, in National and inter-State affairs, were inoperative when, by the act of the parties, the whole case was brought within the jurisdiction and disposal of the State of Ohio.

The aid of legal process from Ohio Courts could not have been obtained, for Ohio has enacted no laws for the control and management of foreign slaves while, for the purpose of sojourn or transit, temporarily within her borders.

With this state of the law, slaves asserting their freedom become practically free. The master has no longer the right of violent subjection to his command, but the State of Ohio extends to both parties the protection of equal laws.

But this possible freedom, this freedom in *posse*, rather than in *esse*, is something which the law of Ohio rather protects than creates. That the slave brought by his master into Ohio, and refusing to return, becomes free, is one of the inevitable results of the proposition that slavery is a creature of law and cannot maintain itself where the laws do not regulate it and provide for its continuance.

But the slave, having been brought to Ohio by the master, returns with him voluntarily to the State of Kentucky; what then is the relation between them? While in Ohio, the Ohio Courts could have determined that, for the whole matter was properly within her control. The act of the parties again changed the jurisdiction, and the whole matter rested again within the control of the State of Kentucky.

The claim upon the State of Ohio for protection against violent abduction was not made. The right to be free was waived. In coming to Ohio, the master voluntarily abandoned his legal power over his slave; and in returning voluntarily, the slave has equally abandoned his claim to freedom.

Upon the return of slaves voluntarily to Kentucky with their master, their relations become confirmed by the laws and jurisdiction of that State, and with that settlement of the question the Supreme Court of the United States has declined to interfere. The law, as thus determined, we have already stated in the earlier part of our opinion.

With reference to the particular case before us, we, therefore, are under the necessity of holding that these defendants, Mary Garner and Simon Garner, Jr., were legally in slavery at the time of their escape on the 26th of January, 1856.

We have given those cases which, in our opinion, are the leading ones upon this subject, and which throw light upon the issues to be met in the case. They are the landmarks by which we have been guided in our decision.

The next and last question to be settled arises under the constitutional provision for the rendition of fugitives from labour under the Fugitive Slave law, and the facts proved in the case render our duty a clear and unmistakable one.

The question is not one of humanity that I am called upon to decide. The laws of Kentucky and of the United States make it a question of property. It is not a question of feeling, to be decided by the chance current of my sympathies. There are to be adjudicated the rights of an institution so agreed to in the formation of our Government as to make it both municipal and federal in its character. It is the essence of the institution that the slave does not possess equal rights with the freeman. The abstract rights to life, liberty and property are in his case replaced by statutes providing expressly for his condition. It has been our duty, as a Court, to listen with attention and, we trust, with courtesy to all those arguments which have urged the decision of this question upon moral rather than legal grounds. We conceive that our highest moral obligation in this case is to administer impartially the plain provisions of the law.

However painful the result may be to the defendants in this case, it is my duty to deliver them—Simon Garner, Sr., Simon Garner, Jr., and Mary Garner, fugitives from service—into the custody of the claimant, James Marshall.

He then proceeded to consider the claim of Gaines to Margaret, alias Peggy Garner, a mulatto woman; Tom, a negro boy; Sam, a mulatto boy, and Sally, an infant girl, claimed by Archibald K. Gaines, of Boone County, Ky., as fugitives from service and labour in the State of Kentucky.

In this case it is claimed by the defence that Peggy, when about six years old, was permitted by her previous master to come to the State of Ohio, and upon that fact they claim that she is entitled to her freedom; and that, being free at that time, and her children being born since, they are also entitled to freedom.

These facts present for our consideration the same question which was raised in the case of Marshall vs. Simon Garner et al., and the decision which we have just announced, applies equally in this case.

We shall, therefore, make the order that the parties named, to wit, Peggy, Tom, Sam, and Silla, be delivered into the custody and possession of the claimant, Archibald K. Gaines.

THE HABEAS CORPUS FOR THE FUGITIVE SLAVES.

Before Judge Leavitt.

A writ of habeas corpus having been issued by Judge Leavitt, at the instance of the United States Marshal, the Sheriff and Marshal both appeared yesterday morning in the United States Court-rooms, with their counsel prepared to argue the case.

The argument was opened by Mr. Headington, counsel for the Marshal. He claimed that the Sheriff's arrest of the fugitives, when placed in the County Jail by the Marshal, was illegal—that no crime could warrant him in making this arrest, and that the only legal way for him to have reached them was by a writ of habeas corpus. He claimed that they were not property, but persons, and as such, were properly "prisoners," and came under the resolution of Congress and the Act of Assembly of Ohio, which authorized the United States Marshal to use the County Jail for the confinement of United States "prisoners." It was all well enough to say that the right of property of an individual must give way to the right of the State to punish a criminal, but he saw no way in which it could be done.

Judge Hoadley, counsel for the Sheriff, replied: He cited cases to show that a habeas corpus *ad subjiciendum* did not lie from one jurisdiction to another—from that of the General Government to that of a State. He considered international law and its application to sovereign States. He claimed the right of a State to punish a slave inhabitant of another State, as clearly as to punish a white citizen of another Commonwealth; for even in the Southern States slaves were regarded by the law as sensible human beings—were punished for all crimes that white men were punished for, and in some States held even to higher accountability, and punished for crimes which in white men were winked at or overlooked.

He also remarked that there was no other means of reaching these criminals—that if they were remanded back to Kentucky, no requisition was applicable to them.

After citing a large number of authorities in support of his positions, he closed his argument by reading an editorial on this case from the New York *Journal of Commerce*, which was republished in *The Gazette*.

Mr. Headington replied, after which Judge Leavitt yielded the bench to Commissioner Pendery, who then gave his decision on the case of Marshall and Gaines. It is understood that Judge Leavitt will give his decision on the habeas corpus this morning at 9 o'clock.

THE SLAVE CHILDREN BEFORE THE PROBATE COURT.

From The Cincinnati Commercial, Feb. 28.

A hearing under a writ of habeas corpus allowed by Judge Burgoyne, alleging the illegal detention, by the United States Marshal, of the three negro children, Samuel, Thomas and Silla Garner, took place yesterday afternoon in the Probate Court.

Mr. Headington, on behalf of the United States Marshal, preliminary to offering any return to the writ, and in the expectation that probably no return would be found necessary, submitted a motion to the Court to dismiss the writ, as allowed without proper consideration, and mainly for the reason that a copy of the cause of commitment had not been produced before the Judge to whom the application had been made.

Copies of the proceedings in the United States Commissioner's Court were then read by counsel, who urged that, although on the original application it may not have been apparent that the allowance of the writ would be improper, it must now become clear, when the facts were all presented, that it was the bounden duty of the Judge to dismiss the writ, having no authority to interfere with the right of the owner of the slave, under the certificate he had received, to carry his slaves back to Kentucky, that right having been found in him by the Commissioner, after full investigation.

Mr. Jolliffe said he represented the infants at the request of their father and mother, who had solicited him to save the children if possible. He admitted that the motion on the other side brought up all the material questions in the case, and proceeded then to urge that the appointment of J. L. Pendery to the office of United States Commissioner was a nullity, because unconstitutional. The Constitution says that all judicial power shall be exercised by certain judges; but here was an individual pretending to exercise such power, holding his court with officers swarming about him like the lictors of a Roman tribunal; and whence did he derive his authority? Under the statute of 1850, which was unconstitutional and void, because it proposed to confer judicial authority on a man who had not been appointed by the President, who did not receive a salary, but a fee of five dollars if he decided the case for the defendant, and ten dollars if in favour of the plaintiff, and held his office during the pleasure of Judge McLean.

Mr. Gitchell, on the same side, further argued the unconstitutionality of the Fugitive Slave law; suggested the absurdity of the proposition, that these young children could be regarded as fugitives, and objected to the proceedings of J. L. Pendery, being received in evidence, because they had no sufficient seal of authentication.

Mr. Headington replied at some length. He declined to discuss the constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave law, a majority of the Judges of the Supreme Court on circuit having decided it was constitutional, and that decision, he contended, concluded this Court. He closed by remarking that a State Court had no right to revise a decision of the United States Court by a writ of habeas corpus any more than a United States Court had to revise the decision of a State Court.

Judge Burgoyne intimated that, in view of the serious and important questions involved, he should require some time to render a decision. He intimated, however, that a majority of the Judges of the Supreme Court having passed on the constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave law was no reason why he should not take up the Constitution and read it for himself, being sworn to suport the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Ohio.

Mr. Ketchum suggested that his Honour was as much bound in conscience to regard the decision of the majority of the Judges of the United States Courts as the express provisions of the Constitution itself.

Judge Burgoyne said that however the decisions of the Judges of the United States Courts might aid him in coming to a conclusion, where the obligations of his conscience were involved, he could not screen himself behind a decision made by somebody else.

Mr. Jolliffe asked the Court to make a special order that the children should not be taken out of the limits of the jurisdiction until the final decision of the case.

Mr. Headington—If such an order is made, it will not be as a matter of consent.

The Court—We ought not to allow the parties to be in any worse condition than if the return had been made, and, therefore, shall enter up the order. We shall probably decide the case on Saturday.

Jolliffe and Gitchell for the petitioners; Ketchum and Headington for the United States Marshal; F. T. Chambers attending as counsel for the claimant of the negroes.

DECISION OF JUDGE LEAVITT.

From The Cincinnati Columbian, Feb. 29.

Judge Leavitt yesterday pronounced his decision in the case of habeas corpus for the bodies of the adult fugitives now lying in our County Jail. Before the decision was given, Judge Hoadley, for the Sheriff, moved to amend the return by stating that the crime for which Margaret Garner was confined was committed before the United States Marshal had her in custody; and, also, that Commissioner Pendery had issued his certificate for the return of the fugitives during the time the present case of habeas corpus was under consideration.

The subject was argued at length by Judge Hoadley and Mr. Headington. As it did not produce any change in the decision, or lead to any modification of the action of Court, we omit the argument, only remarking that Mr. Headington, for the Marshal, commented strongly upon the fact that Commissioner Pendery had pronounced his decision at a time when the fugitives were, *de facto*, out of his jurisdiction, they having been seized by the Sheriff, therefore his decision was only the expression of his opinion, and was as valueless, legally, as if he had expressed it to acquaintances in the street. If the Court should decide that the decision was good, it would bring up a question as important as the one already submitted, that was: can a State writ take a party out of the hands of the United States officers?

Commissioner Pendery explained that before giving his decision he had asked the Attorneys of the parties concerned if they had any objection to his so doing, and understood the arrangement to be satisfactory to them.

Mr. Headington said he had never heard of such a question being asked; his opinion had all along been, that to give a decision under the circumstances was wrong.

Mr. Chambers said for his part he had been a party to no agreement or understanding.

Judge Leavitt said he would give his decision, and the parties might afterward assert any rights they might conceive themselves possessed of.

Ex-Parte, H. H. Robinson, Marshal &c., Habeas Corpus.

"Without taking time to set forth at length the facts appearing in the petition for this habeas corpus, and the return made to it, I may say in brief, that the question involved is, whether the Marshal or the Sheriff of Hamilton is rightfully entitled to the custody of the four persons named in these proceedings. At the time that this writ was sued out, a claim for these persons, with others alleged to be fugitive slaves, was pending and undetermined before a Commissioner of this Court. In the progress of the investigation of this claim, the Commissioner, for the safe keeping of the alleged fugitives, had ordered them to be confined in the jail of Hamilton County, to be brought before him from time to time, as he might adjudge necessary. The Commissioner, on the 20th of February, issued an order to the Sheriff requiring him to produce the bodies of all the alleged fugitives—seven in number—in the morning of the next day at 10 o'clock, to answer to his final judgment in the premises. In pursuance of this order the Marshal made the attempt to get the possession of the persons referred to, but the Sheriff refused to permit him to take them from the jail—the four persons in reference to whom the writ of habeas corpus issued. The return of the Sheriff sets forth as the ground of his refusal that the Grand Jury of Hamilton County having previously returned a bill of indictment against these four persons for the crime of murder in the first degree, a writ of capias was duly issued on the 20th of February, commanding him to take the said persons into his custody, to answer to the said charge; and that, on the same day, pursuant to the command of said writ, he arrested them, then being in the jail of Hamilton County, upon the order for their commitment by the Commissioner as before stated, and made a return of such arrest on the writ of capias. And the Sheriff claims that he is rightfully in the possession of these persons in virtue of these proceedings, and cannot surrender it to the Marshal on his claim.

"The question presented on these facts is one of conflict between the Marshal and the Sheriff as to the legal custody of these persons. It is insisted by the counsel of the Marshal that they were in his custody under lawful process from the Commissioner, and that it was not competent for the Sheriff to arrest them, under the process of the State, while they were so held under process issued by authority of the laws of the United States. On the other hand, it is claimed by the counsel for the Sheriff that the proceeding against them under the Fugitive Slave Act, then pending, and their commitment to the jail of Hamilton County, did not shield them from arrest on a charge of a violation of the criminal law of the State of Ohio.

"In disposing of this question, I am free to confess I have had some anxiety to find a legal basis on which I could satisfactorily reach the conclusion that these fugitives could properly be held in custody under the process of the State, notwithstanding the fact of their being in the prior legal custody of the Marshal. And my first impressions were strongly in favour of the position that, as the claim of the owner in the proceeding under the Fugitive Slave Act was the mere assertion of a civil right, it must be subordinate and yield to the right of the State to assert and enforce its criminal laws. But, upon a closer examination of the principle involved, and the cases referred to as bearing on the question, I am prepared to adopt a different conclusion.

"If the question as to the rightful custody of these four persons could be controlled and governed with exclusive reference to the rights asserted by their owner and claimant, I should have no hesitancy in holding that those rights could not be protected at the hazard of infringing upon the rights and dignity of the State of Ohio. But there is obviously another phase of this subject that presents it in a different and far more imposing aspect. In sustaining, as I am always inclined to do, the just powers and sovereign rights of the State, the claims of the National Government, and the necessity of sustaining and vindicating its laws must not be overlooked. In our compound system, the National and State Governments have their appropriate functions and duties, and it is vital to the healthful action of the system that each should move within its constitutional orbit, thereby avoiding conflicts and collision.

"But without extending my remarks in this direction, I may observe that if the four persons named in the writ of habeas corpus were, at the time of their arrest by the Sheriff, in the custody of the Marshal, under process issued by authority of a law of the United States, I do not see how that custody can be superseded. And I may here remark that, speaking judicially, this question is not affected by the fact that the law of the United States under which the process issues and these persons are in custody may be viewed, even by a majority of the community, as inexpedient, unjust or oppressive. Until repealed, or adjudged void, on the ground of unconstitutionality, by the proper judicial tribunal of the Union, it must be respected and obeyed as law.

"In holding, as I must do in this case, that the right of the Marshal to the custody of the persons in question must be respected, I am not to be understood as asserting that a fugitive slave is not responsible for a violation of the criminal laws of the State to which he may have fled. It is the undoubted right of every State to punish crime committed within its limits. A State destitute of this right in its freest and fullest exercise could have no just claim to sovereignty. And if an escaped slave could violate law with impunity, many States of this Union would be in a most defenceless condition. It is not asserted, therefore, that they are not liable to punishment, but merely that if they are in custody of an officer, under a law of the United States, before their arrest for crime against the State law, the latter arrest cannot be enforced till the disability existing by the prior arrest is removed. In other words, the slave being in the custody of an officer acting under the authority of another, and, for the purposes of this question, a foreign jurisdiction, he cannot, by the mere force of a subsequent arrest, be delivered from such custody.

"In Dorr's case, 3 Howard Rep. 105, Judge McLean, in giving the opinion of the Supreme Court, strongly sustains the position just stated. That was an application for a habeas corpus to deliver Dorr from imprisonment in the State of Rhode Island, and under a sentence for treason committed against that State. Judge McLean says: 'Neither this nor any other Court of the United States, nor Judge thereof, can issue a *habeas corpus* to bring up a prisoner who is in custody under the sentence or execution of a State Court, for any other purpose than to be used as a witness. And it is immaterial whether the imprisonment be under *civil or criminal process*.'

"If it be true, as there asserted, that no Federal Court can interfere with the exercise of the proper jurisdiction of a State Court, either in a civil or criminal case, the converse of the proposition is equally true. And it results that a State Court cannot take from an officer of the United States, even on a criminal charge, the custody of a person in execution on a civil case.

"It is said in argument that if these persons cannot be held by the arrest of the Sheriff under the State process, the rights and dignity of Ohio are invaded without the possibility of redress. I cannot concur in this view. The Constitution and laws of the United States provide for a reclamation of these persons, by a demand on the Executive of Kentucky. It is true, if now remanded to the claimant and taken back to Kentucky as slaves, they cannot be said to have fled from justice in Ohio; but it would clearly be a case within the spirit and intention of the Constitution and the Act of Congress, and I trust that nothing would be hazarded by the prediction that upon demand properly made upon the Governor of Kentucky, he would order them to be surrendered to the authorities of Ohio to answer to its violated law. I am sure it is not going too far to say that if the strictness of the law did not require this, an appeal to comity would not be in vain.

"But I cannot expand on this question. I should have been gratified if time and the nature of my engagements had allowed me to enter more fully into its consideration, and to have noticed the numerous authorities cited in the argument. In my present circumstances, this has been impossible."

This decision was pronounced in a full Court; no signs of approval or otherwise were given. Mr. Headington said that the parties ought to be in Court and formally delivered over; as they were not, he desired the Judge to see his client secured in his rights.

Judge Hoadley said there would be no difficulty; his client would give up the fugitives as the Court had decided.

Mr. Chambers said his client, Mr. Gaines, authorized him to say that he would hold the woman, Margaret, who had killed her child, subject to the requisition of the Governor of Ohio, to answer for any crime she might have committed in Ohio.

Some other conversation was held. Judge Hoadley desired the Court to give the Sheriff a certificate of its order, that he might answer for non-performance of the duties laid upon him by the *capias* put into his hands by the State. The Court agreed to furnish the desired document.

Mr. Headington observed that when the Marshal took possession of the prisoners, it would not be for the purposes named in the writ of *habeas corpus*, but for those for which the Commissioner's certificate was given.

Mr. Hoadley was at a loss to know exactly how the decision left the case, and the Court spoke as if some deep question, that would require much attention if entered into, was not yet taken up. In fact, it appeared as if the decision given did not cover all the ground of conflicting jurisdiction which might arise.

The statement of Mr. Chambers as to his client's holding Margaret subject to jurisdiction being somewhat equivocal, we ascertained from Mr. Gaines himself what his intentions were. He informed us that he should take Margaret back with him into Kentucky. If the Governors of Ohio and Kentucky came to an understanding by which a requisition was made and responded to, so that it became his lawful duty to surrender her for trial in Ohio, he should hold himself ready to obey the law.

This decision, it will be noticed, covers only the four adult fugitives. The decision of Judge Burgoyne as to the three little children will be pronounced at the Probate Court, in the Court-House, to-morrow afternoon, at 3 o'clock.

OUTRAGE AT COVINGTON.

From The Columbian, Feb. 29.

The last act of the drama of the fugitives was yesterday performed by the rendition of the seven persons whose advent into the city, under the bloody auspices of murder, caused such a sensation in the community. After the decision of Judge Leavitt, Sheriff Brashears surrendered the four fugitives in his custody, under a *capias* from an Ohio Court, to United States Marshal Robinson. An omnibus was brought to the jail and the fugitives were led into it—a crowd of spectators looking on.

Margaret, the presumed murderer of her child, was in custody of Deputy-Marshal Brown. She appeared greatly depressed and dispirited. The little infant, Silla, was carried by Pic. Russell, the door-keeper of the United States Court, and was crying violently. Pollock, the reporter of the proceedings in the United States Court, conducted another of the fugitives, and all were safely lodged in the omnibus, which drove down to the Covington ferry-boat; but, although a large crowd followed it, no hootings or other signs of excitement or disapprobation were shown.

On arriving at the Kentucky shore, a large crowd was in attendance, which expressed its pleasure at the termination of the long proceedings in this city by triumphant shouts. The fugitives were escorted to the jail, where they were safely incarcerated, and the crowd moved off to the Magnolia Hotel, where several toasts were given and drank. The crowd outside were addressed from the balcony by H. H. Robinson, Esq., of *The Enquirer*, and United States Marshal for the Southern District of Ohio, who declared that he had done his duty and no more, and that it was a pleasure to him to perform an act that added another link to the glorious chain that bound the Union.

Mr. Finnell, attorney for the claimants, said he never loved the Union so dearly as now. It was proved to be a substantial reality.

Judge Flinn also addressed to the crowd one of his peculiar orations; and was followed by Mr. Gaines, owner of Margaret and the children. After hearty cheering the crowd dispersed.

We regret to have to record that after these rejoicings over the recovery of the seven fugitives, an outrage was perpetrated by a band of low ruffians upon a worthy and estimable member of the press. During the speeches, Edmond Babb, Esq., the reporter of *The Gazette* was taking notes. He was pointed out by some of the persons who had been witnesses on the trial as an Abolitionist—an accusation that we are not aware is warranted by any facts. On his return toward the river, Mr. Babb was struck on the back; turning around to see whence the blow came, he was knocked down by a blow from the fist of one of the mob, and while down was brutally kicked by a number of the crowd. Several respectable persons then remonstrated, and Mr. Babb had an opportunity of rising.

Many calls were then made, "Lynch him," "Tar and feather him," "Ride him on a rail"; at last a call was made that met with a hearty response: "Put the d—d Abolitionist on a cake of ice and let him float to hell!" The crowd moved down toward the river, having the Reporter in their midst. Before they reached it most fortunately, as preventing a yet worse outrage, Mr. Lee, late Deputy under Marshal Ruffin—now Deputy United States Marshal—with five more Deputies, caught sight of him. Lee and his companions at once hastened to the rescue, and drawing the revolvers they had with them for conducting the fugitives in safety through Cincinnati. At the sight of the six-shooters the crowd fell back, and Mr. Babb was safely brought to this side, though suffering severely from blows, kicks and bruises.

This occurrence, the act of unscrupulous rowdies, is much to be regretted, as tending to exasperate feelings already sufficiently excited. The object of this cruelty is a gentleman of slight frame and feeble constitution; his habits are inoffensive and his disposition amiable; his fidelity and correctness of demeanour have gained him the esteem of all who know him. A more unjust selection for such a display of brutality than the one we have recorded could not have been made.

The returned slaves, with several others who attempted to escape over the ice-bridge, and have been kept in Covington jail ever since, will, it is said, be sent down to Vicksburg in a day or two, and sold.

Sheriff Brashears, it is rumoured, will be in a difficult position, he having obeyed a Court of which he was not an officer, instead of returning the *capias*, with a statement of the fact, to his own Court. The Marshal was under an injunction from Judge Burgoyne not to remove the children until his decision of the habeas corpus case regarding them should be delivered on Saturday next, at 3 o'clock. We cannot yet ascertain what notice will be taken of these irregularities.

KANSAS.

Editorial Correspondence of The N. Y. Tribune.

WASHINGTON, Saturday, March 1, 1856.

THE Free State men of Kansas now in this city have letters from various points in that embryo State down to the 18th and 19th ult. Their general tone implies apprehension that a bloody collision is imminent. The Border Ruffians have been raised entirely off their feet by Pierce's extraordinary Messages, which they regard as a complete indorsement of all their past outrages and an incitement to persevere in their diabolical work. It is believed by our friends that the organization of the State Government at Topeka, the coming week, will be made the pretext for a raid, and, if possible, a butchery, at the hands of the Slavery party. I hope such a result will be avoided by the prudence and circumspection of the Free State functionaries, who are expected only to meet, organize, elect United States Senators and adjourn. I could wish to hear that the Legislature would pass a declaratory act, proclaiming the invalidity and nullity of the tyrannical and inhuman enactments of the Border Ruffian assemblage at Shawnee Mission which claimed to be a Territorial Legislature for Kansas.

From The Albany Evening Journal.

AN EXAMPLE FROM MADISON COUNTY.—A movement is on foot in Madison County, to do something for Kansas, of immediate and permanent advantage. One hundred men are to be enrolled to go there forthwith, with Sharp's rifles in their hands, and the plough and the sickle among their baggage. They are to go to fight first, if necessary, and to settle afterwards. They are to be choice men—healthy, industrious, temperate and of good reputation and social position. They will all be young, save a few gray beards, to supply prudence and wisdom. Gerrit Smith says that he will "stand in the gap for all the expenses" of this Madison County contribution to Kansas and Freedom.

This gentleman has given largely to the imperilled Free Soil cause in the Territory, through Boston agents. His last remittance of $250 to the son of Amos Lawrence, was without restriction as to its application. When informed by Mr. L. that it was invested in rifles, he said as did Henry Ward Beecher, that in the cause of human freedom the Sharp's Rifles were moral agents, which it was his duty to supply to those who were compelled to use them.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 8, 1856.

THE NEW YORK OBSERVER.

THE *Observer*, in an article which will be found in its appropriate place on the first page, honours us by setting forth certain extracts from THE STANDARD as illustrations of what it calls "the Spirit of Infidelity." Christianity, in the vocabulary of the *Observer*, being only a synonym for the fashionable but hollow piety which "devours widows' houses, and for a pretence makes long prayers"—which tortures the Bible to sustain slavery and scoffs at the law of God when it conflicts with the statutes of men—we should be sorry indeed if we were anything else than an infidel in the estimation of that paper. The immaculate Son of God was pronounced a blasphemer by the leaders of the Jewish Church and people. "It is enough for the disciple that he be as his Lord; and if they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call him of his household?" The *Observer*, in the extracts it presents from our columns, has done its best (or worst) to convict us of infidelity, but it has signally failed. Its selections are made with the unscrupulous cunning for which it has so long been distinguished. It takes passages out from their connection and suppresses facts which, if fairly and honourably stated, would be, in the eye of prejudice itself, a complete justification of our words. And yet it only succeeds in showing those of its readers who are not utterly blind that our love for the Christianity of Christ is the exact measure of our contempt for the *pro-slavery* Christianity of the American Church; that while we revere the character of Jesus, we have no respect whatever for those, however highly exalted among men, who impiously baptize in his name the system of American slavery. Since the *Observer* did not dare and therefore could not afford to treat us fairly by quoting the whole of the brief paragraphs from which its extracts are taken, we may well congratulate ourselves that, with all its tact at garbling, it has done no worse. Certainly we are content that the passages it quotes from our columns should be regarded as a key to the sort of Christianity which we accept as our rule of life, and upon which we rely for the redemption of the human race.

We must correct the *Observer's* definition of the "Satanic Press." If these words are regarded as fit to designate "that portion of the *secular* press which fears not God nor regards man," how much *more* applicable are they to "that portion of the" *religious* press which is marked by the same moral qualities? The words were first applied by Horace Greeley to Bennett's *Herald*, on account of the low moral standard of that paper and its malignant abuse of reformers. In these particulars the *Observer* stands on an exact level with the *Herald*. They are agreed in treating slavery as patriarchal, patriotic and Christian; they are agreed as to the constitutional and moral obligation of the North to seize and return fugitive slaves; they both regard a statute of the American Congress as paramount to the law of God; both alike hate Abolitionists and denounce them as infidels and disorganizers; both are in full sympathy with the essential principles and policy of the sham Democracy, each striving in its own sphere to promote the designs of that corrupt party; both alike are in sympathy with the Administration in its efforts to strangle Freedom in Kansas, the one openly advocating the cause of the border ruffians, and the other meanly keeping its readers in ignorance, so far as possible, of the facts pertaining to that great struggle of the age, and covering the advocates of liberty with abuse; and they are united in regarding the American Board and the American Tract Society as Christian institutions, and in approving their course in relation to slavery. The *Herald* is a warm admirer of the religion of the *Observer*, and the *Observer* in its turn is in full sympathy with the political principles of the *Herald*. As the latter is, preëminently, the Satanic Press among *secular* journals, so is the former above all others the Satanic Press among the *religious* papers of the country. Nor are we alone in this opinion. There are hundreds of the most intelligent and devoted evangelical ministers of the country who regard its influence upon religion and morals as extremely pernicious, and who would no more advise a parishioner to subscribe for it than they would recommend him to expose himself and his family to cholera or small-pox.

The *Observer* affects in one breath to regard THE STANDARD as a very obscure journal, which nobody reads or hears of, and which the publishers "make for their own amusement"; while in the next it talks of it as "the organ of a *great institution* that meditates and attempts the destruction of" everything that is "both American and Christian," and takes credit to itself as if fighting "the great battle of the age" in levelling its artillery at us! There are some people in the country, possibly, who have never seen nor heard of THE STANDARD, but it has been issued for nearly sixteen years from an office hired for that purpose of the proprietors of the *Observer*, and they certainly have never yet failed to penetrate our obscurity when the rent was due. As for the principal working editor of the *Observer*, he has had in his own personal experience a striking illustration of the usefulness of THE STANDARD in diffusing among the friends of freedom on the other side of the water such a knowledge of the antecedents of American pro-slavery clergymen as suffices to exclude them from places of honour and mark them as objects fitted to excite emotions of disgust and manly indignation. The public opinion of England, thus enlightened, compelled the British and Foreign Bible Society to exclude from its platform the unscrupulous apologist of slavery and slave-catching, the malignant defamer of American Abolitionists, the mendacious assailant of Harriet Beecher Stowe. A public opinion informed by the same spirit is being rapidly developed in our own country, under the influence of those whom the *Observer* affects to despise, but whom it really fears and hates. Already that journal begins to writhe as it feels the premonitory heats of that public reproach which will ere long compel it to make its peace with the outraged spirit of Liberty.

"SAFE IN THE PROMISED LAND."—Our readers have been told that the seven slaves lately arrested in Cincinnati belonged to a company of twenty one, who started from Kentucky together. A letter dated at Amherstburgh, C. W., Feb. 16th, and published in the *Provincial Freeman*, brings us the cheering information that ten of that company—seven men, one woman and two children—have safely arrived in Canada. The writer (L. G. Spears) says: "They travelled from one station to another, sometimes on the Underground and sometimes on the Upperground, until they made their way to the city of Sandusky. Here they found the Lake was frozen. Freedom or Death was their cry! The Underground car had to take the ice. So they took fresh courage, and employed a man with his sleigh to bring them across. He ventured, and brought them to Point Play Island. On their journey they got overtaken by a snow storm, and were carried some miles out of their way. They then came to an opening in the ice, about five feet wide, which they could not see the end of either way, so they were compelled to tear the sleigh to pieces and make a bridge for their horses to cross on; after this, all was well. They staid on Point Play Island that night, and in the morning made a fresh start on a new sleigh, which landed them here safe and sound. They had the privilege to-day of hearing two able sermons preached in the land of freedom." We hope ere long to hear of the safety of the other four, who were expected soon to arrive in "the promised land." The fate of the seven who were arrested in Cincinnati is indeed terrible, but it is consoling to know that two-thirds of the party to which they belonged were fortunate enough to escape the fangs of the kidnapper.

THE OBSERVER ON MORMONISM.

THE *New York Observer* is deeply exercised on account of the evils and immoralities of Mormonism. It says:

"While yet Utah is a Territory of the United States, and before she becomes even an applicant for admission into the Union, we would have measures adopted to promote the moral improvement of that people. Our benevolent and missionary Societies have not turned their attention, as they ought, to Utah as a field of labour. The Constitution of the United States forbids Congress to make any law prohibiting the free exercise of religion, and the Territory may not enact any law in conflict with the United States Constitution. It is therefore plain that missionaries and colporters may be sent there with the Gospel, with Bibles and Tracts, and if the far off pagan tribes are to be visited with such agencies of mercy, why will not our missionary spirit and patriotism suggest such efforts for these wretched polygamists and fanatics, on our own soil?

"Here is a noble object to employ the minds and means of American Christians. Is not Utah worth saving for virtue and for heaven? Or is Kansas everything and Utah nothing?"

The *Observer*, like some other venomous creatures, carries its sting in its tail, as is apparent from this malignant thrust at those who are struggling to preserve Kansas from the blight of slavery. Its zeal for the conversion of "the wretched polygamists and fanatics" of Utah only masks the deadly enmity toward the friends of freedom revealed in its closing interrogatory.

We wish, however, to call attention now to another point. Suppose the American Home Missionary Society, acting upon the *Observer's* hint, should send preachers and colporters to Utah to save the Mormons "for virtue and for heaven," and that the Bible and Tract Societies should lend their aid in the good work. How would the *Observer* have the missionaries, thus commissioned, treat the subject of polygamy? Ought they, in its opinion, to denounce it as a sin against God, to be repented of and forsaken on peril of eternal punishment; or should they follow the example of the missionaries of the American Board in India and admit "the wretched polygamists to the Church, permitting them to cohabit with their forty wives, if they happen to have so many, and only not allowing them to become ministers and deacons? We suggest that the Rev. D. O. Allen, D.D., the missionary of the American Board in India for twenty-five years, and lately returned from that country, would be just the man to head a missionary expedition to Utah. That he would be welcomed by the inhabitants of that Territory we have no doubt, for we see that *The Mormon*, a weekly paper published in this city and devoted to the exposition of the doctrines and practices of the "Latter Day Saints," is highly delighted with the views of polygamy avowed and defended in his recent work on India. Who knows but we may yet have the pleasure of recording the admission of Brigham Young, with his score or two of wives, into an evangelical Church, on the principle so ingeniously set forth by Dr. Allen and acted upon by the Calcutta Missionary Conference? What a triumph that would be of the Gospel—according to the *Observer!*

But even if the missionaries in India (under the direction of the American Board) had not set an example of the "evangelical" method of treating polygamy, the course of the missionaries to Utah, in the case supposed, would no doubt be determined by precedents nearer home. It is a doctrine of the American Church—of that portion thereof at least with which the *Observer* is in affinity—that ministers must confine themselves to their appropriate work of preaching "Christ and him crucified," not meddling with the domestic institutions of the people to whom they are sent, and, above all, not waging war against the laws enacted by the civil authority. Such has long been the *Observer's* doctrine in regard to slavery, which is a system of legalized concubinage and unbridled lust. Now, polygamy in Utah, like slavery at the South, is an institution of the State, and there is not an argument against anti-slavery preaching in Carolina which would not be equally cogent if used to dissuade a missionary from assailing the Mormons for their polygamous practices; and if slaveholders should be admitted to the Church because the patriarchs held slaves and the system was tolerated by the primitive Christians, why should not polygamists be welcomed to religious fellowship for the same reason? The Calcutta Missionary Conference, as quoted by Dr. Allen, took exactly this view of the case, declaring it to be "in accordance with the spirit of the Bible and the practice of the Protestant Church, *to consider the State as the proper fountain of legislation in all civil questions affecting marriage and divorce.*" "*Heathen and Mohammedan marriages and divorces recognised by the laws of the country are to be held valid.*" "If a convert, before becoming a Christian, has married more wives than one, *in accordance with the practice of the Jewish and primitive Christian Churches*, HE SHALL BE PERMITTED TO KEEP THEM ALL." Of course this doctrine is as good for Utah as for India, and hence there is no insuperable difficulty in the way of Brigham Young's conversion to the *Observer's* gospel, or of the annexation of his whole domestic establishment to the evengelical Church. True, he could not, according to the rule adopted in India, be elected a deacon or a minister; but then he could be made an honorary or corporate member of the American Board, or elected to a place in the Executive Committee of the Tract Society, which would probably satisfy his ambition quite as well.

No wonder *The Mormon* is jubilant over this "free-love" gospel of the American Board and the Orthodox Religious Press. We must put its words on record, to shame, if it be possible, these corrupters of Christianity, who would rob it of its glory and its power by making it a cover for the worst iniquities that curse our humanity.

From The Mormon of Feb. 23.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND (EPISCOPALIANS), PRESBYTERIANS, BAPTISTS AND CONGREGATIONALISTS TURNED POLYGAMISTS.

The above may seem strange to many, and its announcement be looked upon as an exaggeration, but it is nevertheless true; and notwithstanding the professed purity of Christian professors who, with sanctimonious looks, solemn visages and affected virtuous indignation, have repelled the polluted polygamous Mormons; notwithstanding the holy horror of an immaculate press, and the fierce declamations of the meek *soi-disant* ministers of Christ, against such practices; and notwithstanding the sacred dread entertained by many of our Senators and Representatives "in Congress assembled" of admitting Utah as a State for fear of "*fastening an incubus*" upon this truly Christian and virtuous nation, it is nevertheless true that the missionaries of those several Churches, before referred to, have unitedly been sanctioning the very things for which the people, the pulpit, the press and Congress have been condemning the Mormons. Such is the world, religiously, politically and socially; and such

A VOICE FROM MR. FULLER'S DISTRICT.

To the Editors of The Standard.

MILLVILLE, Columbia Co., Pa., Feb. 14, 1856.

At a public meeting at Greenwood Seminary, Feb. 11th, called for the purpose of giving expression to public sentiment—James Masters, Esq., in the chair and John Starr, Sec'y—the following resolutions were presented by Wm. Burgess, and, after being discussed at length by Dr. P. John, the mover and others, were adopted with but one dissenting vote.

Whereas, a certain petition from a citizen of this County to the Legislature, praying for the passage of a law to permit slaveholders to carry their slaves across the State, or transiently sojourn therein, having been referred to the Judiciary Committee, which being divided in opinion presented two reports on the same—

1. Resolved, That while we disavow our sympathy with the object of the petition, it is with regret we learn that the majority report was written by the Representative of this District (J. G. Montgomery), inasmuch as we consider the position assumed untenable in point of fact, a startling innovation upon State authority, entirely at variance with the statute of 1847, with all previous judicial decisions of our State, and at war with the sacred principles of liberty and justice.

2. Resolved, That neither in the Constitution of the United States nor in the law of nations, do we find any *positive* recognition of the right of property in human beings; but that slavery is a creature of the State law, entirely local in its character and restricted in its jurisdiction.

3. Resolved, That the clause of the Constitution of the United States respecting the rendition of fugitives imposes no *obligation* on any citizen to assist in their recapture; and, that the law of 1850, commonly known as "The Fugitive Slave law," by its unwarranted assumptions, its urgent demands, its fines and penalties and partial fees, as well as by its restriction upon the rights of free citizens, is a most flagrant usurpation of Constitutional prerogative, a disgrace to our national character, and should be immediately repealed.

4. Resolved, That the course of our Representative in Congress, the Hon. M. M. Fuller, in the recent protracted contest for Speaker of the House, in hoisting his sails for the Southern breeze, has painfully disappointed the expectations of his anti-Nebraska constituents, deprived him of the confidence of many who had been his warm friends and steady supporters, and proved him a regular doughface of the radical school.

5. Resolved, That we hail the election of N. P. Banks to the Speakership at this peculiar crisis, as indicative of many good results and auspicious of the progress of true Republican principles; and we tender our warmest thanks to the sixteen members from Pennsylvania who maintained their cause to its final triumph with unwavering firmness.

6. Resolved, That while we recognise the independent sovereignty of the States, and that Congress has no authority to interfere therein, we nevertheless record our testimony against the encroachments of the impolitic and unrighteous system of servitude in our land, and believe that the peace, prosperity and best welfare of the country demand that all constitutional power should be exerted to restrict it to its present limits, to prevent the erection of any more slave territory, or the admission of any new slave State.

7. Resolved, That, as the restriction of slavery South of 36 deg. 30 min. upon the admission of Missouri, in 1820, was a compromise that would never have been sanctioned by the people of the North had it not been understood and conceded to be a final adjustment thereof; the removal of said restriction upon the formation of Kansas and Nebraska Territories, leaving them open to the incursions of the slave system, was a manifest departure not only from the intention of the framers of our government, but from the plighted faith of the Compromise of 1820, and exhibits a gross perversion of Legislative power and a base subjection to the behests of the slaveocracy of our land.

LECTURES BY CHARLES C. BURLEIGH.

To the Editors of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

For the information of the people of Eastern Pennsylvania and Delaware, permit me to give notice, through your columns, that, at the earnest solicitation of a number of his friends, C. C. Burleigh has consented to deliver in this region a series of carefully prepared lectures on subjects of the highest importance—subjects which have long tasked his highest powers, and which he is qualified to treat with striking originality and eloquence. His friends desire the lectures to be preserved and published in a book.

The following are some of the subjects, to wit: "Christ the Prince of Peace"; "The Future in the Past"; "God's Truth and the Nation's Lie"; "Man Prophetic"; "The Golden Age not Fabulous"; "Union of Slavery and Freedom Impossible"; "God's Daily Talk with Man"; "Human Brotherhood and Divine Fatherhood." The price of admission to these lectures will be 12 1-2 cents.

I am desired to say that those who would secure his presence and services either in Eastern Pennsylvania or Delaware, should make *immediate* application to *him*, at Kimberton, Chester Co., Pa. In a few days he will enter this State, and commence in the Baptist Church at Pughtown on the 4th instant.

Arrangements have been made to have him at Longwood, in the new meeting-house, on the afternoons of the 22d and 23d instant, at 2 o'clock.

It is expected he will attend the First day morning meeting of the Progressive Friends on the 23d inst.

The subject of the first lecture at Longwood will be, "God's Daily Talk with Man"; that of the second, "The Future in the Past."

JOSEPH A. DUGDALE.

Hamorton, Pa., 3d mo. 2d, 1856.

"Our National Example of Democracy," says Parker Pillsbury, in a letter which appears in last week's *Liberator*, "being such a failure, would of itself discourage many of the friends of liberty in England; and then, many of those who sprang up in this country as the champions of free institutions, have proved themselves so unworthy of their high mission as to fill many others with distrust, until John Mitchel and Francis Meagher, with Kossuth and Theobald Mathew, are reckoned only as fit companions of slaveholders, wanting and waiting only an opportunity to become slaveholders themselves. In such hands, the cause of real Republicanism is fast becoming the hissing of humanity, and the hope of the tyrants. Every day confirms me more and more in the vast importance of the doctrine and mission of the American Abolitionists. *Compromise* is the curse of the nations. Our principles are as important in the Eastern as in the Western hemisphere. Alliances made with despots, treaties made with tyrants, are ever the order of the day. 'No Union with Slaveholders' must sweep such false refuges for ever away."

State Legislation in Behalf of Slave-Catching.—A bill is before the Legislature of Wisconsin, which provides for the arrest, by State authority, of fugitives "from service or labour," and their trial before a Justice of the Peace or other magistrate, according to the forms of law; giving them the right of trial by jury, and the benefit of the writ of *habeas corpus*. The Milwaukee *Sentinel*, regarding the Fugitive Slave law as an invasion of State Rights, as well as a violation of the Federal Constitution, is yet in favour of slave-catching by the authority of the State! The *Free Democrat* denounces the movement as one involving the commission of a crime against justice and humanity.

Household Words (*American Reprint*).—The number for March closes the twelfth volume of this popular miscellany. The following are the contents: Travellers' Contrivances; Christmas in Southern Italy; Blobbs of Wadham; The Tomb in Ghent; The Road in India; Colours and Eyes; Dr. Graves on Warwick street; The Sisters, in four chapters; New Year's Eve; Claret; Guzla; Christmas Toys; Nobb and Snob; Old Blois; Chip—the Legend of Argis; Double Life; The Land Shark; A Zoological Auction.

"The Holly-Tree Inn," being the extra Christmas number of *Household Words*, is under the same cover. New York: Dix & Edwards, 321 Broadway.

Hon. Henry Wilson will deliver the Seventh and last Lecture of the Anti-Slavery Course in Philadelphia, on some evening of next week, of which due notice will be given in the daily papers. If any reader of The Standard needs evidence that Mr. Wilson is a man of great ability, force and courage, we ask him to turn to the first page and read his brave speech on the Kansas Question. We don't wonder that slaveholding and doughface Senators writhed like serpents under the strokes of his lash.

From our Boston Correspondent.

NO. CLXXXIV.

The Argument.—The Correspondent on the advent of March—He treateth of the worship of Mercury—He showeth considerable erudition—He conjecturetn the political opinions of Jack Frost—He telleth of his own sorrows as a Man of Letters—He glorifieth Procrastination and blaspheneth the Copy Book—The new Siege of Boston—The Army of the Aliens—The Correspondeut digresseth to the Know-Nothings—He comforteth Gov. Gardner and rejoiceth in the new crop of greatness—He vaticinateth concerning Pangborn—He telleth of the Twenty-Second—Of its Genesis—Of Mr. Everett's Oration—He maketh a recommendation to Mr. Fillmore—He commendeth Dr. Holmes's mixture. And giveth a sample—He commendeth it—He augureth well for the Union—He justifieth Mr. Everett in his opinion as to the poets Holmes and Tennyson, &c., &c., &c.

Boston, March 3, 1856.

March has come at last, rather leonine than lamb-like in his aspect. Winter seems reluctant to quit his hold of us and disposed to help himself to a good slice of our scanty Spring. Yesterday we had a brisk snow-storm and to-day the landscape in every direction is fit for any winter painter to freeze upon canvass. Meteorologiomaniacs, wretches who worship the Thermometer and leave their warm beds at four o'clock every morning, in order to record the responses of their idol, these fanatics have assured me that we have not had such a Winter as this for some sixty years. Mercury has told them so, and though he is well known to be a slippery god and one that would as soon lie as not, still when they have once caught him and imprisoned him in a glassy shrine (for, like Proteus, "*sine vi non ulla dabit præcepta*"), they think he can be relied on. And he tells strange stories of the unusual hardship of the Winter. It seems to me that we have not had so many days of excessively, inordinately, indecently cold weather, before which Mercury himself shrinks into the farthest recesses of his cell and shows as little as possible of himself to his devotees, this year as usual. But the embargo, almost as bad as that of Mr. Jefferson, which Mr. John Frost has laid upon all our rivers and harbours, I suppose must be taken as a proof that the average has been a good deal worse than common. That personage is plainly a Strict Constructionist and goes against Internal Improvements and in favour of Union, on Constitutional principles. Though, indeed, the Union which he has favoured between Kentucky and Ohio has carried a good many of the "props" of our Glorious *ditto* "to slide" across and withdraw themselves from its support, notwithstanding the entreaties of Dr. Holmes, of this city, breathed forth in lyric frenzy—of which I may speak again before I get through.

I know to my cost the inconvenience which this embargo has caused to the world of letters. I mean to the world of letters which is daily conveyed between your city and this. Before, I could put off writing my letters until after dinner, and yet have time to slip them into "the indiscriminate, all-swallowing orifice of the Common Post," which was left yawning for them in the Providence Station up to the last moment before the Stonington train took its leave for New York. Since the Ice Blockade, however, I have had to get my correspondences ready by two o'clock to ensure their safe delivery in New York the next day. You, who know how sparing I am of time, may conceive of my annoyance at having my good habits of procrastination thus molested. I have already protested to you, or I am mistaken, against the base libel of the Copy Book against that cardinal virtue in proclaiming it "the Thief of Time!" I renew the protest. I deny the charge. I thrust it back in the teeth of the Copy Book. I defy it to the proof. Procrastination the Thief of Time! It is the Save-all of Time. For, if you put off doing a thing until the last possible moment, is it not clear that you save all the preceding time, which you would probably have dawdled away if you had given yourself any to spare? It is as clear as preachiug—at least, as a good deal of it. You will "excuse my passion in a case like this." Injured virtue is too apt to want a friend. This virtue shall never want one while I can hold a pen. In these days of Reforms, I call for a New Version of the Copy Book! For an Expurgated Edition! Are the morals of our Youth thus to be corrupted by the first draughts they take at the fountain of learning? Forbid it, O Sacred Cause of Education! I am happy to learn to-day, however, that the Stonington Boat floats once more and that I have my precious three hours restored to me again. If my letters have any virtue, they owe it to my faithful cultivation of divine Procrastination.

Our Common presents a very funny appearance in consequence of the hard Winter. The streets having been so effectually blocked up by snow and ice, the authorities have employed a small army, chiefly recruited from the ranks of our Irish fellow-citizens, to cut them up with plough and spade and cart them in lumps upon the Common. So that as far as you can see it presents the aspect of a tumbling sea—not a *mer de glace* so much as a *mer de bone*—a sea of mud rather than of ice. It is not sightly just now, but when the kindly alchemy of Nature shall have resolved the lumps into their original particles, and when they shall have infused "deep into Nature's breast the spirit of her hues," we shall see them rising again in light and glory, clothing the earth with green and crowning it with flowers. This has been a God-send, too, to the poor labourers employed on the work. Hence,

> "Health to himself and to his children bread
> The labourer bears,"

and the inevitable distress arising from the interruption of ordinary labour has been much mitigated by this public succour. And it was succour in the best possible form, that of useful employment and honest wages. There could hardly have been expended a like amount of money for the relief of the poor that would have done as much good. But still there has been suffering enough, especially among the recent emigrants.

And speaking of these puts me in mind of the Know-Nothings. It is said that the nomination of a battered, broken-down, spavined, wind-galled politician like Mr. Fillmore has given but small contentment to the Saints of that persuasion, hereabouts. I have not heard how Gov. Gardner likes the ticket. People who pretend to know what other people think, say that he had expected his name to stand second at least on the ticket, in consideration of his refusal to remove Judge Loring and his Veto of the Personal Liberty Bill. But he will probably have to learn that gratitude is no part of our Republican Edifice, and least of all of that part of it where it rests directly on the Corner-Stone. Mr. Webster's fate might have told him that. But when did a politician ever learn to be wise by another's harm? The principal astonishment that we have felt has been at the crop of great men which that Convention proved to have grown up here in Massachusetts without our knowing anything about it. Who those eminent persons might be—Mr. Pangborn and the rest of them, whose names besido I can't recall—who went up there to arrange our affairs for us, I have not yet seen the man that had the remotest idea. It is consolatory to know how much better off we are than we thought we were. But then three years ago the genius of a Gardner was cramped behind the counter of a Milk Street Jobbing House, which has since burst forth into such sudden and wide-spread blaze. Who knows but Pangborn may yet become a household word full of harmony and of high associations?

And the Know-Nothings bring me naturally to the next head of my discourse, viz., the Celebration of Washington's Birth-day. For that the sudden revival of Washingtonian enthusiasm this year was a *dodge* of the Know-Nothings is plain for all folk to see. It was got up with an eye to the polls next Autumn. Dr. Johnson said once that "Cave could not spit over the window without thinking of the Gentleman's Magazine" (which he had set up); so no free and enlightened American can spit anywhere without thinking of the next election—than which no stronger proof can be given of the everlasting vigilance with which he pays for his liberty. Everybody, however, played into their hands. The day was made a general holiday. The schools, and the banks, and the public offices, and a good many of the shops were closed. We had ringing of bells and firing of cannon, and in the evening we had Mr. Everett's Oration in the Music Hall. People had to pay a dollar for assisting at this feast of eloquence and patriotism, and yet the large hall was crammed as full as it could hold. Indeed, it was affirmed that high premiums were offered to the fortunate holders of tickets for a chance of getting in. As Mr. Everett is to repeat the Discourse in New York you can hear it if you please, and have a chance. It was a most elaborate and polished performance, and delivered with all those graces of manner and utterance to which that eminent gentleman has attained in so high a degree. It was observed with some pain that Mr. Webster's name was only once mentioned, and that the Union was saved with a moderation rather savouring of good taste than of burning zeal. Mr. Everett's zeal, however, cannot be questioned, of which we are sure we see a recognition in the invitation he has received to deliver this same Address before the ladies of Richmond, Va. And, in case Mr. Fillmore should be elected, I recommend Mr. Everett to him as a suitable Secretary of State, with a hope (I cannot honestly say *a chance*) of the succession. Fuller recommendations will be furnished on application at the Office of The Standard.

But if the Union suffered any lack of attention at the hands of the Orator of the evening (which I do not at all admit), any such deficiency was made up by the assiduous care of the poet of the occasion. I need not say that Dr. Holmes compounded the Ode which was prescribed and administered that night. This gentleman has vindicated too clearly his claim to the office of Physician in Ordinary to the Union to allow the possibility of any irregular practitioner being suffered to intrude upon the treatment of the illustrious patient even to cross the edge of the wildest of imaginations. He it was, then, that prepared the mixture, of which I must beg you to let your readers have this slight taste. They are the two concluding stanzas.

> By the name that you inherit,
> By the sufferings you recall,
> Cherish the fraternal spirit;
> Love your country first of all!
> Listen not to idle questions
> If its bands may be untied;
> Doubt the patriot whose suggestions
> Whisper that its props *may slide!*
>
> Father! We whose ears have tingled
> With the discord notes of shame;
> We, whose sires their blood have mingled
> In the battle's thunder flame;
> Gathering, while this holy morning
> Lights the land from sea to sea,
> Hear thy counsel, heed thy warning;
> Trust us, while we honour thee!

It is enough to say that this is a specimen brick of the whole construction. I need not point out to your readers the resounding march of the lines, the genius that gleams through them, the blasting sarcasm which flashes from the eighth line and stays not till it scathes the Speaker's Chair. Dr. Holmes has achieved what Byron could not. He seized upon a word that was lightning and he launched it at Mr. Banks's head. If the Speaker can hold on to his chair after this, he must be indeed thunder-proof.

The last stanza is Pindaric in the highest degree, and all the more so for a delicious obscurity that overhangs it like a golden mist. I am not sure what "the discord notes of shame" may be; nor is it perfectly clear how a respectable assembly of solid men of Boston, sitting in the Music Hall at eight in the evening, could be said to be

> "Gathering, while this holy morning
> Lights the land from sea to sea"!

But, bless your souls, if you will only open Pindar in the original, you will find plenty of passages as hard to understand as these. It is the essence of this mode of the lyre. The expression of "the battle's thunder flame" is startling and original. The only parallelism that it suggested to my mind is to be found in a ballad of love and vengeance, which is one of the few that sometimes stir even my torpid soul to song. A gentle lady, disguised in male attire, pursues her lover on shipboard, where, finding him false, she slakes her vengeance in his blood and that of her rival. The ballad then proceeds thus, and I commend it to all interested in Women's Rights:

> "When that the Captain come for to hear on 't,
> He werry much applauded her for what she had done;
> And immediately made her First Lieutenant
> Of the gallant Thunder Bomb!"

"Let me make the songs of a nation, and I care not who makes its laws," said somebody, I forget who. No one can doubt that the Union is safe in the care of such a Tyrtæus as Dr. Holmes. Mr. Everett has been taken to task in some of your papers, I have observed, for saying, at the Webster Dinner, that he was willing "to pit Dr. Holmes as a poet against Tennyson." But surely without reason, for certainly Tennyson could never have written such an Ode as this.

D. Y.

From our Cincinnati Correspondent.

The Conclusion of the Slave Case—Bridge across the Ohio—Re-election of Senator Wade—Testimonial to Gov. Chase.

Cincinnati, March 1, 1856.

The decision in the slave case was given by the United States Commissioner on the 26th of February, remanding all the fugitives back to their masters, and on the afternoon of the 28th they were delivered up by the Sheriff to the U. S. Marshal, who, with his deputies, conveyed them to the Ohio river, and they were soon on Kentucky soil and in custody of their masters again. Mr. Gaines, the owner of the woman, before leaving the city, made repeated professions of his entire willingness to have her brought to Ohio by requisition of the Governor, to be tried for murder by our Courts, and to hold her ready for that purpose whenever the demand shall be made in legal form. What reliance is to be placed in these promises, and whether the Governor of Kentucky will deliver the woman up, we shall soon see. Gov. Chase, it is to be hoped, will lose no time in making the proper demand. The usual excuse offered by the Executives, both of slave and free States, when refusing to deliver up fugitives from justice or from labour, that the alleged crime was not regarded as a criminal act by the statutes of the State to which they had fled, cannot come in here, as murder is a crime in every State and every civilized community the world over. For my part, I shall be *agreeably disappointed* if the woman is ever returned for trial by the Kentucky authorities. As for the men, indicted as accomplices, no one here expects to see them again. I am informed that they will be shortly sold to go farther South.

The decision of Commissioner Pendery is published at length in some of our papers, occupying two columns or more, and consists mainly of references to legal decisions in this country and England tending to show that the master of a slave taking or sending him into free territory for a short time and for a temporary purpose, without any intention of making it his residence, does not thereby lose his right of property in him. Thus he sets aside as insufficient the plea of the counsel for the fugitives, that having been, in years past, repeatedly sent to a free State, they had thus acquired their freedom. When the above decision was made the fugitives were in custody of the Sheriff, who would not give them up until the U. S. Marshal had obtained a writ of *habeas corpus* from Judge Leavitt of the U. S. District Court. This point was argued before Judge Leavitt on the 26th, just before the decision of the Commissioner was made, but Judge Leavitt did not decide on the application until the 28th. Judge Leavitt then felt himself bound to yield to the superior authority of the General Government and deliver up his prisoners.

On the day before the slaves were taken away, a motion was made and argued before Judge Burgoyne, of the Probate Court, for a writ of *habeas corpus* to obtain the three children and restore them to their mother, but the decision of Judge Leavitt and the determination of the Sheriff to conform to it, rendered nugatory all proceedings of this kind. It is an encouraging sign of the times that our State Judges seem much more anxious than they were some years since to insist upon State rights, and to construe the laws, wherever possible, in favour of freedom. The decisions of the United States authorities in this case strike few if any persons with surprise. They were such as intelligent men generally expected, but it is some consolation to the friends of freedom to know that very few of the fugitives comparatively are captured. Where one case is brought before a U. S. Commissioner, fifty (and probably more) escape safely to Canada.

The bridge of ice over the Ohio has led to the revival again of the Bridge project which was agitated and discussed so much on both sides of the river some years since. A public meeting was held lately, in Covington, of those favourable to the object, in which it was resolved to urge the matter again, and procure subscriptions to the Stock. The completion of the Lexington Railroad to Covington, last Summer, has led to a vast increase of travel and of crossing the river at this point, and a good bridge would certainly be a great accommodation to the public. But here the ubiquitous spectre of slavery presents itself and claims its share of attention and respect. The Charter granted, some years ago, by the Kentucky Legislature made the Bridge Company liable for the value of all fugitive slaves who might escape upon it to Ohio, and this provision the Legislature of this State refused to recognise or insert in the Charter. At the meeting above referred to one of the speakers recommended that this provision should not be urged upon Ohio, as the Courts of Kentucky could be resorted to for redress, and would, no doubt, grant it in any suits brought against the Company for the value of escaping slaves, even were the charter silent in regard to the subject. This is *very considerate*, as the chance of getting any such a provision through an Ohio General Assembly is more hopeless than ever.

The celebration of the 22d February in this city passed off pleasantly to all participating in it until evening, when a gross insult was offered to Gov. Chase. A banquet was partaken of at night, at the Burnet House, by upwards of eight hundred persons, many of whom were invited guests, among whom were Gov. Chase and both Houses of the State Legislature. When called upon to respond to one of the regular toasts, Mr. Chase was *hissed* by a contemptible set of political partisans who repeated this mark of disapprobation whenever his name was called, and Mr. Chase soon after left the room. Not only the friends of Gov. Chase, but *gentlemen* of all parties, feel this to have been a downright insult to one who, in moral worth, in ability and official station, stood as high as any one in the assembly. I am glad to state that, as a mark of respect, the merchants of the city have tendered a public dinner to Gov. Chase. The invitation has been lying at the Merchants' Exchange for several days, and has been signed by the leading merchants' of the city, comprising men of all parties. If the men who perpetrated this insult think that they have *injured Mr. Chase* or the Republican party by such conduct, they are much mistaken. Free Soil principles are destined to thrive and triumph in despite of such mean opposition.

Since writing the above, I have learned that Hon. B. F. Wade has been reëlected to the U. S. Senate for six years, and by a large majority, too, showing how thoroughly the Ohio General Assembly adheres to the Republican principles it was chosen to sustain. The vote was, Senate—Wade 28, Todd 6. House—Wade 72, Todd 30. Scattering 2. Joint vote—Todd 36, Wade 100, Scattering 2. Well done for Ohio! Yours, P.

Our Philadelphia Correspondence.

Philadelphia, March 4, 1856.

Messrs. Editors: We hear less about Disunion, from Southern men in Congress and out of it, now-a-days than we used to. What is the reason? Answer: the firmness of the Northern men at Washington, in supporting Banks, and the pluck of Northern men in Kansas in driving back the Ruffians.

Things look favourable in Kansas. The Missouri invaders are becoming weaker as the Free State men increase in strength. Atchison has been repudiated by the Legislature of his own State, and is condemned by a majority of the people of his own County. It is not probable that he will have influence enough to collect a force that will be able to cope with the Free State army that will be ready to take the field in the Spring.

Gen. Pomeroy has been here, and has made a speech to a public meeting, called for the purpose, on the affairs of Kansas. The meeting was large and enthusiastic. Prof. Cleveland presided, and E. W. Capron acted as Secretary. The statements made by Gen. Pomeroy excited a lively interest among his hearers. A Mr. Elliott, from St. Louis, replied to Gen. Pomeroy, and endeavoured to refute some of his assertions; but his efforts were futile. The General, in a rejoinder, confirmed out of Mr. Elliott's own mouth what he had said, and deepened the impression which had already been produced in his favour.

Aid was solicited to enable the settlers to maintain their ground against the invaders, and to carry out the beneficent purposes of their emigration; and Passmore Williamson and Prof. Cleveland were appointed a committee to collect and receive subscriptions. Upwards of $1,500 have been raised by these gentlemen and others interested in the object—all of it from citizens of Philadelphia—and it is hoped that this sum will be doubled in time to make the whole amount available for the exigencies of the opening Spring. The fate of Kansas, as a free or slave State, will be decided in the next three months, and it devolves, therefore, upon the friends of Liberty to do whatever they mean to do, quickly. A number of our merchants, not known as Abolitionists, have given a hundred dollars each. Others of smaller means have given in proportion. If this should fall under the notice of any one who has not been solicited, but who would like to give, let him send, by mail or otherwise, either to Prof. Cleveland, 3 Clinton street, or to Passmore Williamson, corner of Seventh and Arch streets. Anything thus sent will be duly received and faithfully appropriated.

Our National Nominating Know-Nothing Convention was a most extraordinary conglomeration of heterogeneous materials. Confusion worse confounded prevailed without intermission during almost the whole of its sessions. From accounts, Babel must have been order in comparison with it. Of course, slavery was the exciting and dividing question. The results of the Convention you know. They were, first, a separation of the Northern, anti-slavery element, and, second, the nomination, by those who remained behind, of Millard Fillmore, of New York, and Andrew Jackson Donelson, of Tennessee, for the offices of President and Vice-President of the United States. This nomination was made by the votes of Southern delegates. The whole affair is Southern and pro-slavery from beginning to end. Millard Fillmore is the signer of the Fugitive Slave law, and Andrew J. Donelson is, as he himself stated to the Convention, "the owner of over a hundred slaves." So you see that, though there will be three tickets, there will only be two parties in the field; the party for Slavery and the party for Freedom. The Fillmore and Donelson people will only be a wing of the Slavery party. The Republicans, I suppose, will select a man for their nominee who will receive the support of all the anti-slavery voters of the country. Who this will be, the Convention to be held in June will make known.

Mrs. Antoinette Brown Blackwell delivered the sixth lecture of the Anti-Slavery Course, on Saturday evening. A violent snow storm prevailed all afternoon and evening, increasing in fury as the hour for the meeting approached, and, as a consequence, the audience was not large. The speaker seemed to feel this, and, as a consequence, did not do herself full justice. At least so those say who have heard her on other occasions. I, who had never had this pleasure, was very much pleased. Her subject was "Margaret, the Slave-Mother, or a history of the Cincinnati Fugitive case." Her recital of the facts in this appalling tragedy was touching, and, in some of its passages, moved the audience deeply. But she mixed it up with doctrinal teachings on the subject of duties under Government, and physical force, which, before such an audience, and coming from a woman, sounded oddly enough. The ballot and the bullet were both defended as legitimate weapons in the anti-slavery warfare, and the "keen steel blade" was specifically described as the sure auxiliary to which she would resort in a certain contingency which she indicated. I am not a non-resistant, but I must confess that something of a cold creep passed over me while I listened to this part of her discourse. Mrs. Blackwell's lecture was extemporaneous. Perhaps if what she had to say on these points had been previously reduced to writing, her sentiments would have been found less open to criticism. As a whole, the discourse was an able one and will do good. I rejoice that we have a woman of Mrs. Blackwell's endowments to devote herself to the public defence of righteousness and freedom.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Discourses, by W. H. Furness, Pastor of the First Congregational Church in Philadelphia. Pp. 308. Philadelphia: G. Collins, 1 South Sixth street. New York: C. S. Francis, 253 Broadway.

It is not often that we meet with a volume of Sermons which calls for any special notice and commendation in our columns. But here is one whose thought and aim are so in accordance with the line of our own purpose, and whose author we so sincerely honour for his tried fidelity to the cause of the slave, that we should be unwilling to pass it by. It is not a volume of Anti-Slavery Sermons; but through the whole run those great lines of Righteousness and Humanity upon which the Anti-Slavery Movement is based, and in some of them these lines are concentrated with unmistakable power upon the great sin of our nation. We all know with what faithfulness and directness Dr. Furness has for many years spoken from his pulpit in this behalf; with what courage, calmness, and constancy, against what opposition and persuasion, he has fulfilled the pulpit's duty.

The volume contains thirteen Sermons, under the titles: Stand upon thy Feet; The Way of Salvation; The Mystery of the Gospel; The Inspiration of Christianity; The Peace of Jesus; The Example of God; Death, a Change; Sources of False Doctrine; Christ Crucified; Jesus and Little Children; Organized Wrong; The Prayer of Jesus; The Sign of Divine Authority. And these familiar topics are treated with great freshness and unfolded into unexpected relations; and there is not one reminiscence of the stereotyped phraseologies and consecrated commonplaces which are the usual pulpit contributions to their discussion.

We are struck at the outset with the great simplicity of style which characterizes the book. It is utterly and most refreshingly free from the exaggeration and rhetoric which are the easily besetting sin of our popular writers and lecturers. The thought here utters itself in the clearest, directest way; simple, vigorous, unentangled by verbiage, the sentences go straight to the mark. It is the style of a man who is too much in earnest to think of style. Yet it is not meagre or bald, but often clothes itself naturally in figures, which are still clothing, not ornament.

And the thought is as simple, sinewy and forthright as the style. No dreamy reveries, no subtle speculations, no weighty or adroit reasonings are offered us, but the direct assertions of conscience and the soul, and the unambiguous appeal to both. These are eminently "moral discourses." And they are thoroughly religious. For their morality is no matter of rules and regulations, nor of external good conduct; it is the proclamation of the commanding moral sentiment, the solemn injunctions of Truth, the law of eternal Right, the will of the living and present God. It is a religious righteousness, that, in the conscience recognises God's voice, and in every present Duty God's revealed command and work. For to this man Religion is no private luxury of feeling, no mere personal solace or security. Much less is it dogma or theological opinion. It is nothing less than Life and Power within. To him the love of God is the love of pure Truth, of absolute Justice; the way of salvation is the awakening of man's highest nature to the enthusiastic love of the Supreme Good; the Inspiration of Christ was the Eternal Truth and Love of him; the Peace of Jesus comes through an entire devotion to the True and Right. There is no Christianity save in a devotion like his to the cause of Humanity. And no one can hope to know Jesus Christ save he come into a living sympathy with him, by sharing his pity for the wrongs and sorrows of the poor; his indignation at their heartless and hypocritical oppressors; by consecrating himself through all opposition and persecution, fearless of governments and majorities, to the service of the reform movements of his own day. In these great movements lie the sublime opportunities of gaining the fellowship of Jesus and the knowledge of God. So does Mr. Furness, in true prophet words, proclaim the "kingdom of God and his righteousness." And that kingdom of God is not a mystic heaven, "the world of bliss beyond the grave, but a condition of things to be realized here upon earth . . . a state of this world, of human society, in which not the selfish pride and savage passions of men, not cruelty and oppression, but God, shall reign, reign through his Justice and Mercy, enthroned in human hearts, creating the institutions and controlling the intercourse of mankind. Wherever Right and Humanity are the Supreme Law, to which all else is subject, there God reigns, and there is the Kingdom of Heaven."

The theology of these volumes is liberal and spiritual, but not technical, a theology of ideas, not of systems.

Very long may this true watchman stand upon his outposts, and—while other preachers are prophesying smooth things, and with timidities and reserves and acquiescences and love of peace and fear of trouble, with plausible rhetoric and diabolical logic are deadening the conscience of men—continue to cry in trumpet notes to an unbelieving age that Righteousness only exalteth a nation, and that the people that forget God shall surely be cast down to destruction.

A Forest Tragedy and other Tales. By Grace Greenwood, author of "Haps and Mishaps of a Tour in Europe," "Greenwood Leaves," etc. Boston: Ticknor & Fields.

This volume contains five distinct stories, as follows: A Forest Tragedy; The Minister's Choice; St. Pierre, the Soldier; Alice's Tryst; The Child Seer. The author's numerous friends will welcome a new book from one who has won their respect and admiration by her former labours, and who wields her pen not alone to amuse her readers, but to awaken in them a higher reverence for truth and a deeper love of humanity. The volume is dedicated to Mary Howitt, "as a proof that 'many waters cannot quence love'—as a tribute of admiration, esteem, and faithful remembrance" on the part of the author.

The Panorama of Life and Literature, No. 9, for March, made up of selections from the current numbers of *The Living Age*, presents the following table of contents: Who are "The Kings of the East"? Sir William Pepperell, the New England Baronet; Fielding and Thackeray; Preserving the Purity of Elections; Polyglot Miss Bailey; Art of Perfumery; The Ballads of Ireland, by Edward Hayes; Ballad of Bouillabaisse—at the Church Gate; A Century of Acrostics; Aluminum, the New Metal; Prescott's Philip the Second, of Spain; The Song of Hiawatha; Life and Works of Goethe, by G. H. Lewes; How I became an Egyptian; The Baby Trooper; Romance and Reality; The Old House of Darkbrothers; Reformation of Inebriates; Rupert's March, by G. W. Thornbury; The Comic Artist—Here I Love; The Great Explosion at Sebastopol; Hymns; Whaling in the Faroe Islands; Mary Sutherland; West Wind—Two Interpreters—Moss Rose; Great Volcanic Eruption in Hawaii; Poetry; Short Articles. The price of this monthly is only $3 per annum. Littell, Son & Co., Boston.

Littell's Living Age, No. 615, opens with a very interesting review, from the *London Quarterly*, of the Table-Talk of John Selden, S. T. Coleridge and Martin Luther. "How I grew to be an Old Maid," from *Bentley's Miscellany*, is a capital story, and so is "The Land-Shark," from *Household Words*. The other selections are appetizing as usual. New York: 343 Broadway.

Summary.

A correspondent informs us that a venerable professor in one of the oldest Presbyterian Theological Seminaries, lately advised a student instead of going on a mission to the Indians of Nebraska, "to go to Kansas; if need be to take Sharpe's rifle, and by all means to cast a free soil vote to assist in making Kansas a free State."—*Independent*.

Slave Emancipation Case.—At New Orleans, a few weeks since, a lady who owns twenty slaves that she feels desirous of emancipating, applied to the First District Court for permission to set them free, and allow them to remain in the State. The jury in the case could not agree, thus virtually refusing to comply with the petition. The idea of the jurors was, that there was too much of that sort of population now, and that they should be removed out of the State.

Obstinate Refutation.—Lucy Roberts, a coloured woman, closed recently at her residence in Marriott street, Philapelphia, a life of obstinate and protracted refutation of the dough-face slander, that negroes cannot take care of themselves. She was 106 years old, and till within two years of her death, supported herself creditably by washing clothes. Many men of this same stock in the slave States, beside maintaining themselves for near a century of time, have by their labour fed and clothed three generations of white people.—*Albany Evening Journal*.

Better be a Dumb Bell.—The lecture on slavery, delivered at the Tremont Temple on Thursday evening of last week, by Hon. James Bell, U. S. Senator from New Hampshire, was a very tedious, worthless effort—unrelieved by a single valuable thought or expression—and was suited to the state of things thirty years ago, advocating as it did gradual emancipation, the compulsory purchase of the slaves by their own extra toil, and the colonization of the entire coloured population to the coast of Africa! The employment of such a Rip Van Winkle ranks next in the grotesque to that of the slaveholder Toombs.—*Liberator*.

The Rev. Theodore Parker lectured at Concord, N. H., a few evenings since. Before commencing his lecture he stated that the evening before he had received from Alabama an advertisement stating that one Thomas Foster was always ready to catch any "negro dogs" that had run away from their owners. The specimen of "the chivalry" who sent the notice to Mr. Parker had written on it, "What do you think of this, you d—d white-hearted, slave-stealing scoundrel?" Mr. Parker said he had received a good many *academic* honours in his day, but never before had he had the title of Doctor of Divinity bestowed on him in *small capitals?*"—*Tribune*.

Having a Hard Time of It.—Mr. Gilman, of Boston, whose lectures on Yankee humour we have already copied some good things, at one of his late gatherings introduced a capital story. A clergyman in Boston, meeting with one of his congregation who recently came into possession of quite a handsome property by the death of his brother, inquired how he was getting along with the settlement of the estate. "Oh," said he, "I am having a dreadful time; what with getting out letters of administration, and attending probate court, and settling claims, *I sometimes almost wish he had'nt died!*"—*N. O. Picayune*.

A Fugitive Sermon.—A clergyman of a small town between this city and Newburyport, started on the Sunday of the great snow storm to reach his church, with his two sermons in his pocket, but old Boreas who cut up so many pranks on that day, blew both sermons from our minister's pocket, who saw them take wings and fly away. After a vigorous pursuit, he was enabled to catch one of the fugitives, while to his dismay he saw the other scattered leaf by leaf, and blown into some woods hard by. A wag in his society suggested that the congregation had that day been spared the infliction of being compelled to listen to a *rambling* sermon.—*Portsmouth Gazette*.

Taylor's Musicals.—This company of coloured vocalists gave a Concert at the Town Hall on Wednesday evening. We were not present, but a friend who was, and who is a much better judge of such matters than we profess to be, speaks in terms of commendation of their performance. It met a decidedly favourable reception from the audience, so much so, that by request, they repeated their Concert on Thursday evening. We know of no other company of coloured vocalists in the country. They are deserving of a full share of patronage among the numerous companies competing for public favour.—*A. S. Bugle*.

Anti-Slavery Meetings.—Notice was last week given of a series of Anti-Slavery Meetings to be held at several different points in this (Allegany) County, a part of which we this week repeat, with additions. The speakers announced are J. W. Loguen, of Syracuse, and John W. Jones, and his sister, of Elmira. All three are fugitives, and though graduates from the "peculiar institution," are nevertheless much better prepared to interest and instruct an audience, than a majority of "collegiates." The sister of Mr. Jones was some three years since "made free," that is, as free as a fugitive slave can be made in this country; to accomplish which considerable expense was incurred, all of which has not yet been paid. An effort is now being made to raise the sum in arrears, and there is no reason why the call should not be responded to with an open hand, on the part of a liberty-loving people.—*Genesee Valley Free Press*.

Our Lecturing Excursion to western New York, recently, was attended with some drawbacks not put down in our programme. The weather proved

Miscellaneous Department.

SONG OF THE VERMONTERS.

The following spirited verses are taken from the life of that brave man and true patriot, Ethan Allen. They were published in 1780, and allude to the contest then going on between Vermont, New York and New Hampshire, with reference to the separate existence of Vermont as an independent State. The contest was kept up to the close of the Revolution. Congress being unable to settle it, General Washington took it in hand, and his candour and good sense effected, through Gov. Chittenden, what Congress could not have done.—*Columbus (Wis.) Reporter.*

[These lines are attributed, on what may be considered good authority, to John G. Whittier, the Quaker poet, and were not published in 1780, as above stated in the *Columbus* (Wis.) *Reporter*. From the desire not to offend the peace-loving fraternity with which the poet is connected, he has never claimed the authorship of this spirited lyric of his early days, which certainly does no discredit to his poetical genius :]

Ho! all to the borders! Vermonters, come down,
With your breeches of deer-skin and jackets of brown;
With your red woollen caps, and your moccasins, come,
To the gathering summons of trumpet and drum!

Come down with your rifles!—let gray wolf and fox,
Howl on in the shade of their primitive rocks;
Let the bear feed securely from pig-pen and stall;
Here's two legged game for your powder and ball!

On our South come the Dutchmen, enveloped in grease;
And arming for battle, while canting of peace;
On our East, crafty Meshech has gathered his band,
To hang up our leaders, and eat out our land.

Ho! all to the rescue! For Satan shall work
No gain for his legions of Hampshire and York!
They claim our possessions—the pitiful knaves—
The tribute we pay shall be prisons and graves!

Let Clinton and Ten Broeck, with bribes in their hands,
Still seek to divide us, and parcel our lands;
We've coats for our traitors, whoever they are;
The warp is of FEATHERS—the filling of TAR!

Does the "Old Bay State" threaten? does Congress complain?
Swarms Hampshire in arms on our borders again?
Bark the war-dogs of Britain aloud on the lake?
Let 'em come! what they CAN, they are welcome to take.

What seek they among us? The pride of our wealth
Is comfort, contentment, and labour and health:
And lands which, as Freemen, we only have trod,
Independent of all, save the mercies of God.

Yet we owe no allegiance; we bow to no throne;
Our ruler is law, and the law is our own;
Our leaders themselves are our own fellow-men,
Who can handle the sword, the scythe, or the pen.

Our wives are all true, and our daughters are fair,
With their blue eyes of smiles, and their light flowing hair;
All brisk at their wheels till the dark even fall!
Then blithe at the sleigh-ride, the husking and ball!

We've sheep on the hill-sides; we've cows on the plain,
And gay-tasselled corn-fields, and rank-growing grain;
There are deer on the mountains, and wood-pigeons fly
From the crack of our muskets, like clouds in the sky.

And there's fish in our streamlets and rivers, which take
Their course from the hills to our broad-bosomed lake;
Through rock-arched Winooski the salmon leaps free,
And the portly shad follows all fresh from the sea.

Like a sunbeam the pickerel glides thro' his pool,
And the spotted trout sleeps where the water is cool,
Or darts from his shelter of rock and of root
At the beaver's quick plunge or the angler's pursuit.

And ours are the mountains which awfully rise
Till they rest their green heads on the blue of the skies;
And ours are the forests, unwasted, unshorn,
Save where the wild path of the tempest is torn.

And though savage and wild be this climate of ours,
And brief be our season of fruits and of flowers,
Far dearer the blast round our mountains which raves,
Than the sweet Summer zephyr which breathes over slaves.

Hurrah for VERMONT! for the land which we till
Must have sons to defend her from valley and hill;
Leave the harvest to rot on the field where it grows,
And the reaping of wheat for the reaping of foes.

Far, far from Michiscoui's valley, to where
Poosoonsuck steals down from his wood-circled lair,
From Shoticook river to Lutterlock town—
Ho! all to the rescue! Vermonters, come down!

Come York, or come Hampshire—come traitors and knaves!
If ye rule o'er our *land*, ye shall rule o'er our *graves;*
Our vow is recorded—our banner unfurled;
In the name of Vermont, we defy *all the world.*

BOOKS BEFORE PRINTING.

In an age like the present, it is difficult to conceive the intellectual condition of our ancestors of the middle ages, who, living before the invention of printing, were almost wholly without books. Among the numerous publications which give its character to our own time, we are fortunate in falling upon one which holds a torch to the past, while further illumining the present; and the well-known name of the writer is a sure guarantee for the admirable way in which his spiriting is performed.* Our readers are indebted to Mr. Knight's lucubrations throughout for whatever benefit they may fancy they derive from this attempt to give them some notion of Books before Printing.

Less than five hundred years ago, such books as there were belonged exclusively to scholars, or rather to the ecclesiastical corporations, which; under the name of abbeys, monasteries, and the like, included amongst their members, not only everybody that had any pretence to learning, but almost everybody that had the ability to read. An old writer, Richard de Bury, Bishop of Durham, who, in 1344, wrote a Latin treatise on the "love of books," avowedly prepared it solely for the clergy, and seems to have treated the notion of there being any other class of readers with a magnificent contempt. "Laymen," says he, "to whom it matters not whether they look at a book turned wrong side upwards, or spread before them in its natural order, are altogether unworthy of any communion with books." It is presumable that he would not have said this if laymen had then been at all in the habit of reading. It is indeed a fact, that even many of the clergy, and men of the monastic orders, were very imperfect readers; and, according to the good bishop's view of their qualifications, some of them were hardly more fit to be intrusted with books, than the despised and unlettered laity. In the treatise alluded to, his lordship is not sparing of his reproach in regard to the frequent misuse of books which had come under his notice. He reprobates the unwashed hands, the dirty nails, the greasy elbows leaning upon the volume, the munching of fruit and cheese over the open leaves, which were the marks of careless and idle readers. With a solemn reverence for a book, at which, as Mr. Knight remarks, we may now smile, but for which we can hardly help respecting him, he says: "Let there be a mature decorum in opening and closing volumes, that they may neither be unclasped with propitious haste, nor thrown aside after inspection without being duly closed"—an admonition still worthy of attention in certain quarters, though of course its observance is not of so much consequence as it was in the fourteenth century, before the invention of printing.

The good bishop's own collection of manuscript books was a somewhat considerable one for the times in which he lived; and he appears to have made a goodly use of it. He bestowed a number of volumes upon a company of scholars residing in one of the Halls at Oxford, and instituted a "provident arrangement" for lending books to strangers—meaning by strangers, students of Oxford not belonging to that Hall. One item of the arrangement may, on account of its curiosity, be quoted: "Five of the scholars dwelling in the aforesaid Hall are to be appointed by the master of the same Hall, to whom the custody of the books is to be deputed: of which five, three—and in no case fewer—shall be competent to lend any books for inspection and use only; but for copying and transcribing, we will not allow any book to pass without the walls of the house. Therefore, when any scholar, whether secular or religious, whom we have deemed qualified for the present favour, shall demand a loan of a book, the keepers must carefully consider whether they have a duplicate of that book; and if so, they may lend it to him, taking a security which, in their opinion, shall exceed in value the book delivered." Anthony Wood, who, in the seventeenth century, wrote the lives of eminent Oxford men, speaks of this library as formerly containing more books than all the Bishops of England at the same time possessed. He tells us further that, "after they had been received, they were for many years kept in chests, under the custody of several scholars deputed for that purpose." In the time of Henry IV., a library was built in the college which is now called Trinity College, and then, says Wood, "the said books [meaning those given by Richard de Bury] were put in pews, or studies, and chained to them." The statutes of St. Mary's College, Oxford, in the reign of Henry VI., are quoted in Warton's *History of Poetry*, as furnishing a remarkable instance of the inconveniences and impediments to study which must have been produced by a scarcity of books: "Let no scholar," says one of them, "occupy a book in the library above one hour, or two hours at most, so that others shall be hindered from the use of the same." From this we learn at once the exceeding scarcity of books in those times, and the great care that was taken to preserve them. At an earlier period, however, the scarcity must have been still greater, and the process of reading of a slower operation, as we find that it was the custom of librarians in the monasteries, to give out a book to each member of the fraternity at the beginning of Lent, to be read diligently during the year, and to be returned the Lent following. The original practice of keeping the books in chests would seem to indicate that they could not be very frequently changed by the readers; and the subsequent plan of chaining them to the desks, suggests the notion that, like many other things tempting by their rarity, they could not be safely trusted to *anybody's* hands. It was a very common thing to write in the first leaf of a book: "Cursed be he who shall steal, or tear out the leaves, or in any way injure this book."

But notwithstanding this primitive difficulty of getting access to books, there is abundant historical evidence to show, that the ecclesiastics of those olden times did their utmost to multiply them for the uses of their particular establishments. In every great abbey there was a room called the scriptorium, or writing-room, where boys and novices were constantly employed in copying the service books of the choir, and the less valuable books for the library; whilst the monks themselves laboured in their cells in transcribing missals and compendiums of the Bible. Equal pains were taken in providing books for those who received a liberal education in collegiate establishments. Warton says: "At the foundation of Winchester College, one or more transcribers were hired and employed by the founder, to make books for the library. They transcribed books, and took their commons within the college, as appears by computations of expenses on their account now remaining." But there are several indications that even kings and nobles had not the advantages of scholars by profession, and possessing few books of their own, had sometimes to borrow of their more favoured subjects. It is recorded that the prior of Christ Church, Canterbury, had lent to Henry V. the works of St. Gregory; and he complains that, after the king's death, the book had been ungenerously detained by the prior of Shene. The same king had borrowed from the Lady Westmoreland two books that had not been returned; and a petition is still extant, in which she begs his successors in authority to let her have them back again. Louis XI. of France, wishing to borrow a book from the Faculty of Medicine at Paris, they would not allow the king to have it till he had deposited a quantity of valuable plate in pledge, and given a joint bond with one of his nobles for its due return. The books that were to be found in the palaces of the great, a little while before the introduction of printing, were for the most part highly illuminated manuscripts, and bound in the most expensive style. In the wardrobe accounts of King Edward IV., it is stated that Piers Bauduyn is paid for "binding, gilding, and dressing of two books, twenty shillings each, and of four books, sixteen shillings each." It should be borne in mind that twenty shillings in those days would have bought an ox. But this cost of binding and garnishing did not include the whole expenses; for, we are informed, there were delivered to the binder no less than six yards of velvet, six yards of silk laces, tassels, copper and gilt clasps, and gilt nails. As the price of velvet and silk was then enormous, we may conclude that these royal books were as much for show as use.

One of the books thus garnished by Edward IV.'s binder, is called *Le Bible Historiaux* (the Historical Bible), a work of which several manuscript copies may still be seen in the British Museum. In one of them, the following paragraph is written in French: "This book was taken from the King of France at the battle of Poitiers; and the good Count of Salisbury, William Mountague, bought it for a hundred marks, and gave it to his lady Elizabeth, the good countess. . . . . Which book the said countess assigned to her executors, to sell for forty livres." From another source, we learn that the great not only procured books by purchase, but employed transcribers expressly to make them for their libraries. In a manuscript account of the expenses of Sir John Howard, afterwards Duke of Norfolk, it is stated that in 1467, Thomas Lpmpnor—that is, Thomas the Limner—of Bury, was paid the sum of fifty shillings and twopence for a book which he had transcribed and ornamented, including vellum and binding. The limner's bill is made up of a number of items—for whole vignettes and half-vignettes, capital letters, flourishing, and plain writing. That books were in those days luxuries which few people could spare the money for, may be seen from a letter of Sir John Paston, printed in the collection called the *Paston Letters*. Writing to his mother in 1474, Sir John says: "As for the books that were Sir James's (the priest's), if it like you that I may have them, I am not able to buy them, but somewhat would I give: and [as to] the remainder, with a good devout heart, by my troth, I will pray for his soul." Think of a man seriously proposing to pray for a person's soul, by way of paying the balance of a valuation for books which he could not meet in cash! It shows us that our modern notions of book-buying and devotion differ very widely from those that were entertained in 1474. Sir John's offer, however, but reflects the simple superstitious piety of his time; and in these more favoured and enlightened days, we must blame rather his time than him for the absurdity. It was a kind thing of him, at any rate, to leave us an inventory of his books—only eleven in number, one or two of which appear to have been collections of small tracts—showing us what constituted a gentleman's library in the fifteenth century.

Bookselling in those days had not yet grown to be a separate or special business; but it nevertheless appears there was an actual trade in books, and that there were schemes and plans devised for making them, to some extent, of general use. In Paris, as early as the middle of the fourteenth century, people who dealt occasionally in books were commanded to keep a number of them for hire; and in a register of the University of Paris, M. Chevillier found a list of books so circulated, and the price of reading each. Of course, the circulation must have been limited to persons of rank and learning. "That," as Mr. Knight remarks, "the ecclesiastics and lawyers constituted the great bulk of readers, and that the addition of a book, even to the private library of a student, was a rare occurrence, is evident from the absolute necessity for manuscript books being dear. If the number of readers had increased—if there had been more candidates for the learned professions—if the nobility had discovered the shame of their ignorance—if learning had made its way to the Franklin hall—manuscript books could never have been cheap. But from the hour when a first large expense of transferring the letters, syllables, words, and sentences of a manuscript to movable type was ascertained to be the means of multiplying copies to the extent of any demand, then the greater the demand, the greater the cheapness.

If the nobles, the higher gentry, and even the lawyers and ecclesiastics, were indifferently provided with books, we cannot expect that the yeoman had any books whatever. The merchants and citizens were probably somewhat better provided. The labourers, who were scarcely yet established in their freedom from bondage to one lord, were probably, as a class, wholly unable to use books at all. Shakspeare, in all likelihood, did not much exaggerate the feelings of ignorant men—who at the same time were oppressed men—when he put these words in the mouth of Jack Cade, when addressing Lord Say: "Thou hast most traitorously corrupted the youth of this realm, in erecting a grammar-school; and whereas, before our forefathers had no other books but the score and the tally, thou hast caused printing to be used; and, contrary to the king, his crown and dignity, thou hast built a paper-mill." The poet has a little deranged the exact order of events, as poets are justified in doing, who look at history not with chronological accuracy, but with a broad view of the connection between events and principles. The insurrection of Cade preceded the introduction of printing and paper-mills into England. Although during four centuries, we have yet to lament that the people have not had the full benefit which the art of printing is calculated to bestow upon them, we may be sure that, during its progress, the general amelioration of society has been certain, though gradual. There can be no longer any necessary exclusiveness in the possession of books, and in the advantages which the knowledge of books is calculated to bestow on all men.

When books were so costly and so inaccessible to the great body of the people, as they necessarily were before the date of printing, bookselling was carried on by merchants as one of the various branches of their business. There were, indeed, a class called stationers, who had books for sale, and who probably executed orders for transcribing books. Their occupation is thus described by Mr. Hallam, in his *Literature of Europe*: "These dealers were denominated stationarii, perhaps from the open stalls at which they carried on their business, though statio is a general word for a shop in low Latin. They appear, by the old statutes of the University of Paris, and by those of Bologna, to have sold books upon commission; and are sometimes, though not uniformly, distinguished from the librarii—a word which, having been originally confined to the copyists of books, was afterwards applied to those who traded in them. They sold parchment and other materials of writing, which, with us, though, as far as we know, nowhere else, have retained the name of stationary; and naturally exercised the kindred occupation of binding and decorating. They probably employed transcribers." But the merchants in their traffic with other lands, and especially with the Low Countries, now called Holland and Belgium, appear to have been the agents through whom valuable manuscripts found their way to England; and in this respect, it has been remarked, they were something like the great merchant-princes of Italy, whose ships not unfrequently contained a cargo of Indian spices and of Greek manuscripts. John Bagford, who, about 1714, wrote a slight life of Caxton, the first English printer, which is in manuscript in the British Museum, says: "Kings, queens and noblemen, had their particular merchants, who, when they were ready for their voyage into foreign parts, sent their servants to know what they wanted; and among the rest of their choice, many times books were demanded," which they were ordered to buy "in those parts where they were going." Caxton himself tells us in the *Book of Good Manners*, which he translated from the French and printed in 1487, that the original French work was delivered to him by a "special friend, a mercer of London." This commerce in books could not have been very great, and certainly not great enough to employ a special class of traders.

So long as books existed only in manuscript, and could be multiplied only by the laborious transcription, the authors, of course, enjoyed but a restricted reputation. Yet some of them attained a considerable renown, and from kings, princes and the higher nobility, received a liberal degree of patronage. In England, the poems of Geoffrey Chaucer were undoubtedly familiar to all well-educated persons, however scanty was the supply of copies, and however dear their cost. The poet Gower, a contemporary of Chaucer, seems also to have gained a considerable popularity. His principal poem, *Confessio Amantis*, printed by Caxton in 1483, is said to have been the most extensively circulated of all the books that came from the press—a fact which leads us to conclude that it must have previously been in great demand. The poem has all the elements required for popularity in those times, being full of stories that were probably common to all Europe, running on through thousands of lines with wonderful fluency, though with no great force. The play of *Pericles*, ascribed to Shakspeare, is founded upon one of these stories. Romances of chivalry, stories of "fierce wars and faithful lovers," were then especially the delight of the great and powerful. When the noble was in camp, he solaced his hours of leisure with the marvellous histories of King Arthur or Launcelot of the Lake; and when at home, he listened to or read the same stories in the intervals of the chase or of the feast. Froissart tells, in a simple and graphic manner, how he presented a book to King Richard II., and how the king delighted in the subject of the book: "Then the king desired to see my book that I had brought for him; so he saw it in his chamber, for I had laid it there ready on his bed. When the king opened it, it pleased him well, for it was fair illumined and written, and covered with crimson velvet, with ten buttons of silver and gilt, and roses of gold in the midst, with two great clasps, gilt, richly wrought. Then the king demanded me whereof it treated; and I showed him how it treated matters of love; whereof the king was glad, and looking in it, and read it in many places, for he could speak and read French very well." Froissart being a Frenchman, wrote in French; but even Englishmen at that period often wrote in the same language, and some of Gower's early poems are in French. According to his own account, the long poem of the *Confessio Amantis*, above referred to, was written in English at the command of the same King Richard; whence it would appear that royal personages were among the first to encourage the cultivation of the vernacular language.

Somewhat later than Gower and Chaucer, lived John Lydgate, a monk of Bury, who was a very popular poet, and possessed great versatility of talent. Warton says: "He moves with equal ease in every mode of composition. His hymns and his ballads have the same degree of merit; and whether his subject be the life of a hermit or a hero, of St. Austin or Guy Earl of Warwick, a ludicrous or legendary, religious or romantic, a history or an allegory, he writes with facility. He was not only the poet of his monastery, but of the world in general. If a disguising was intended by the company of gold-smiths, a mask before his majesty at Eltham, a May-game for the sheriffs and aldermen of London, a mumming before the lord-mayor, a procession of pageants from the creation for the festival of Corpus Christi, or a carol for a coronation, Lydgate was consulted, and gave the poetry." A fine illuminated drawing in one of Lydgate's manuscripts, now in the British Museum, represents him presenting a book to the Earl of Salisbury. Such a presentation may be regarded as a first publication of a new work before the date of printing. The royal or noble person at whose command it was written bestowed some rich gift upon the author, which would be his sole pecuniary recompense, unless he received some advantage from the transcribers for the copies which they multiplied—which in most cases is unlikely. Doubtful as the rewards of authorship may be in an age when the multiplication of copies by the press enables the reader to contribute a small acknowledgement of the benefit which he receives, the literary condition must have been far worse when the poet, humbly kneeling before some mighty man, as Lydgate does in the picture, might have been dismissed with contumely, or have had his present received with a low appreciation of the labour and the knowledge required to produce it.

The fame, however, of a popular writer was of a kind far more direct and flattering than belongs to the literary honour of modern days. There is little doubt that the narrative poems of Chaucer, Gower and Lydgate, were familiar to the people through the recitations of the minstrels. Mr. George Ellis, in his agreeable work of the *Rise and Progress of English Poetry*, observes: "Chaucer, in his address to his Troilus and Cressida, tells us it was intended to be read 'or elles sung,' which must relate to the chanting of the minstrels; and a considerable part of our old poetry is simply addressed to an audience, without any mention of readers. That our English minstrels at any time united all the talents of the profession, and were at once poets and reciters and musicians, is extremely doubtful; but that they excited and directed the effort of their contemporary poets to a peculiar species of composition, is as evident as that a body of actors must influence the exertions of theatrical writers. They were, at a time when reading and writing were rare accomplishments, the principal medium of communication between authors and the public; and their memory in some measure supplied the deficiency of manuscripts, and probably preserved much of our early literature till the invention of printing." We may thus learn that, although the number of those very few whose minds could be elevated by reading, the compositions of learned and accomplished men might yet be familiar to the people through the agency of a numerous body of singers and reciters. There has been a good deal of controversy about the exact definition of the minstrel character—whether the minstrels were themselves poets and romance writers, or the depositories of the writings of others, and of the traditional literature of past generations. Ritson, a writer upon this subject, says: "that there were individuals formerly who made it their business to wander up and down the country chanting romances, and singing songs and ballads to the harp, fiddle, or more humble and less artificial instruments, cannot be doubted." They were a very numerous body a century before Chaucer, and most indefatigable in the prosecution of their vocation. They even appear to have become at length something of a nuisance, like the barrel-organs and hurdy-gurdies that now infest the quieter portions of our towns. There is a writ of declaration of Edward II., which complains of the evil of idle persons, under colour of minstrelsy, being received into other men's houses to meat and drink; and it then goes on to direct, that to the houses of great people, no more than three or four minstrels of honour shall come at most in a day; "and to the houses of the meaner men, that none come unless he be desired; and such as shall come, to hold themselves content with meat and drink, and with such courtesy as the master of the house will show unto them of his own good will, without their asking of anything." Nothing can more clearly exhibit the general demand for the services of this body of men; for the very regulation as to the nature of their reward, shows plainly that they were accustomed to require a liberal payment, and it was only when their demands began to approach towards extortion, that the state found it needful to interfere with them. After this enactment, they struggled on in a sort of vagabondish manner, sometimes prospercus and sometimes depressed, according to the condition of the country, till the invention of printing came to make popular literature always present in a man's house. The *book* of ballads or romances which was then to be bought, could be constantly retained without the incurring of any charges for "meat and drink"; for, in the words of Richard de Bury, whom we quoted in the beginning, books "are the masters who instruct us without rods, without hard words or anger, without clothes and money. If you approach them they are not asleep; if, investigating, you interrogate them they conceal nothing; if you mistake them, they never grumble; if you are ignorant, they cannot laugh at you." To this truthful and judicious eulogy, let us append Milton's more modern and more eloquent laudation: "Books," says he, "are not absolutely dead things, but do contain a potency of life in them to be as active as that soul whose progeny they are; nay, they do preserve, as in a phial, the purest efficacy and extraction of that living intellect that bred them. I know they are as lively and as vigorously productive as those fabulous dragon's teeth; and being sown up and down, may chance to spring up armed men. And . . . . unless wariness be used, as good kill a man as kill a good book; who kills a man, kills a reasonable creature—God's image; but he who destroys a good book, kills reason itself—kills the image of God, as it were, in the eye. Many a man lives a burden to the earth; but a good book is the precious life-blood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."

The inestimable advantage of good books, printing has secured to us as an inalienable possession. Whosoever will, may at a trifling cost procure them. These few particulars, relating to the condition and commercial circumstances of literature prior to to the use of printing, may nevertheless be interesting to the readers of this journal. Taken in contrast with the present state of knowledge, and the means existing for its dissemination, they may serve at least to show the great advances that have been made since William Caxton first set up his printing press at Westminster. To appreciate all the advantages of the present, it is sometimes advisable to look into the past, and to contemplate from that position the higher ground of benefit and convenience to which we have attained. Without the mechanical contrivance of printing, the thoughts and ennobling imaginations of genius could never have become possessions to any but the affluent and favoured few; but by means of that imperishable invention, they can now be made available to the uses of all who have learned the simple art of reading; and a man's poverty, unless it be extremely desperate, need no longer hinder him from sharing the wealth of mind and fancy which was meant for the common inheritance of mankind. —*American Publishers' Circular.*

The Old Printer and the Modern Press. By C. Knight. Murray, London.

THE LATE MRS. CLARKSON.

On Thursday, the 21st ult., died, at Playford Hall, near Ipswich, aged 83, Mrs. Catharine Clarkson, the relict of Thomas Clarkson, he who stood in the front of that noble band of labourers which, after many years of seemingly hopeless toil, effected the abolition of the African Slave Trade. This venerable lady was a native of our town—the eldest (Mr. Robert Buck, of Nowton, being the youngest, and now the sole survivor) of the children of Mr. William Buck, many years a resident of considerable influence, from Yorkshire—the younger brother of the Recorder of Leeds, whose daughter married Sir Francis Wood, a wig-baronet, and whose grandson is Sir Charles Wood, a Cabinet Minister under several Whig administrations.

Mrs. Clarkson was for many years confined to the couch of an invalid, but yet the fit companion, the solace, and the support of her husband in his long labours and trials by her peculiar qualities. She was distinguished by her social virtues, her animation, and her colloquial eloquence. It was by these qualities that, when Mr. Clarkson was compelled to suspend his labours and take up his residence in Westmoreland, she, as well as her husband, obtained the warm and permanent friendship of Wordsworth, Coleridge and Southey, the allied poets, and Charles Lamb, their congenial friend, as appears in numerous passages of their several works. She was by no means the passive comfort of her husband during his long labours. Mr. Clarkson, destined to the church by his long education, had taken deacon's orders, when he renounced the functions of a clergyman, in order to discharge the special duty he had imposed upon himself. He had at the same time embraced opinions in favour of civil and religious liberty, which afforded a pretext to the supporters of slavery to accuse him of Jacobinism (the Radicalism of the generation). He found allies in the family and dissenting connections of his wife. Mrs. Clarkson's mother was of a dissenting family, a Corsbie, widely connected; and her sister, the parent of a numerous well-known family, was a Hardcastle. Among the most active members of the abolition body was Mr. William Smith, M.P. for Norwich, whose family were through life the dearest friends of Mrs. Clarkson. When her health permitted she was the companion of her husband on his several missionary journeys. She attended him to Paris, when he in vain strove to obtain from the assembled sovereigns of Europe a declaration that the Slave Trade was piracy; and enjoyed with him his triumph at the close of his career, when he received from the hands of the Lord Mayor the record of his admission to the freedom of the City of London, in recognition of his Abolition services, and an indirect expression of the national sense of the wrong he had sustained at the hands of the sons of Mr. Wilberforce. Mrs. Clarkson had been declining for some years. But her faculties remained sound till within a short time of her departure, which was without suffering, but not without hope. She attained an age beyond that given to mankind in general, and has left as large a number of friends, who honoured and loved her, as those can expect who survive their proper generation, the companions of their youth.—*Bury (Eng.) Post.*

ANTI-SLAVERY LITERATURE.

One of the incidental advantages of the great contest of principle which is now going on in this country between freedom and slavery, is its effects upon our national literature. A friend was once saying, "I want a specimen of a purely and peculiarly American production to send to France." "Send a copy of the American Fugitive Slave law," was the dry reply.

But if this law and the institution it defends are peculiarly American, so also is the great controversy to which it has given rise, and so also will be the wide and varied literature which has been washed up from the very depths of our national character by the surges of this great excitement. It has called forth most brilliant displays of forensic eloquence in the Senate chamber, of sacred enthusiasm in the pulpit, of earnest and manly vehemence in the lecture-room. It is teaching our whole nation to think, feel and reason.

A few years ago there was no anti-slavery literature, and a book devoted to the subject could scarce find a publisher who dared issue it, and it lay under the ban of public opinion when issued. Now, every publisher and every press pours out anti-slavery books of every form and description, lectures, novels, tracts, biographies.

Not among the least interesting of these are the biographies of former slaves written by themselves. It is a thing which must always be interesting to us to know how a human heart like our own felt and thought and struggled, coming up in so strange and unnatural a state as that of slavery. It is to be presumed, *à priori*, that the men who have fought their way through all the fearful perils which beset the path from slavery to freedom, are no ordinary men; and such memoirs as those of Josiah Henson, Henry Bibb, Lewis Clark, Wm. Wells Brown and Frederick Douglass, show this.

With all the incidental faults of imperfect education, they show vigour, shrewdness and originality. We have in them speculations on the question of human rights from the slave's own point of view—a position essentially different from that of South-side Doctors of Divinity.

More recently Douglass has enlarged and republished his original memoir, and even in a literary point of view it is a work of uncommon force and merit, and will compare favourably in point of style and execution with any work of the kind in our language. Douglass has a natural genius for writing. His very earliest essays, in the rude form in which the autobiography first appeared, showed a capability of terse, nervous, compact style very uncommon. The exigencies of the anti-slavery cause have developed this talent, and Douglass as a writer and speaker now will be confessed to hold no middle rank even among men who have had every advantage of classical education. He stands now as a light-house to show the boiling shoals and eddies, the fearful yawning caverns of that great Maelstrom from which he scarcely escaped. He is an answer, known and read of all men, to the false theology which says "that man ought to be contented in a state of slavery," for we think the hardiest pro-slavery man will not venture to say that Frederick Douglass would have done better to have remained to the end of life a dreary drudge on Col. Lloyd's plantation.

Under this head of slaves' experiences we might mention a collection which has lately been published by Mr. Drew, who travelled through Canada, visited all the different settlements, and took down narratives of fugitives from their own lips. Any one interested in the practical workings of slavery can learn very much from these.

A very creditable work also has been issued by Mr. Wm. C. Nell, a young coloured man in Boston, on the coloured patriots of the Revolution, in which he brings to light many acts of bravery and devotion which show the negro to have been devoid neither of boldness nor of shrewdness, during the exigencies of those perilous times. It is a book every way calculated to excite the pride and self-respect of the race, and in the general style of composition does credit to the author.

The American Anti-Slavery Society is now issuing a series of tracts for gratuitous disposition—titles and authors of which have a promising sound. The subjects of them touch upon all the more important bearings of the controversy. For instance, No. 4, Does Slavery Christianize the Negro? By the Rev. T. W. Higginson. —No. 5, The Inter-State Slave Trade. By John G. Palfrey.—The Ruin of Jamaica. By Richard Hildreth.—To Mothers in the Free States. By Mrs. E. L. Follen.—Influence of Slavery upon the White Population. By a Lady.—How can I Help Abolish Slavery? By Mrs. M. W. Chapman.—The American Tract Society and its Policy of Suppression and Silence; being the Remonstrance of the Fourth Congregational Society in Hartford, Ct.—The God of the Bible Against Slavery. By Rev. Charles Beecher.

These tracts are short, condensed and to the point, and they who can advance the good cause in no other way, may often do it by calling attention to some one of these.

A very fair and well-written work has appeared from the press of Mr. Jewett this year, entitled "Tour Among the Planters," written by Mr. C. G. Parsons, of Maine. This gentleman, it appears, having business connections at the South, was led to travel there and investigate very closely the condition of society, not excepting those general and favourable impressions which often mislead strangers. He made minute and patient investigations, going behind the scenes as well as before, and handling the ropes and pulleys and screws which produced the illusion, with true Yankee freedom. The book shows the miserable economical effects of slavery as exhibited in the almost incredible neglect, waste and confusion in all departments of life. The chapter on slaveholders as business men contains facts which men, educated at the North, could scarcely believe. That on Southern jurisprudence would be almost equally incredible, were it not confirmed by such histories as that of Delia Webster. The book is written in an entertaining and graphic style. We have observed some extracts from it, translated into a recent number of the Parisian *Journal des Debats*. The book in itself would impress one with an idea of the fairness of its author, and it contains many facts worthy of study in this time when intelligent men are compelled to make up their minds as to the comparative merits of the two systems of labour now pursued in our country.

The most complete and thorough work of this kind, however, is one entitled "Our Seaboard Slave States." By Mr. Frederic Olmsted, already favourably known to the public by his Walks and Talks in England. Mr. Olmsted's book is the most thorough expose of the economical view of this subject which has ever appeared; himself a practical farmer, having visited and surveyed the farming of the Old World, he set out upon a tour to explore the farming of the New. His style is simple, natural and graphic, and he is so far from being carried away by his feelings that one sometimes wonders at the calmness with which he will relate the most astounding facts. He never hesitates to admit a merit or give praise when it is due. He has not sought for stimulating and highly coloured accounts of tyranny and cruelty, but restricted himself to the quiet tone of one who is making an agricultural and economical survey. He shows us the sordid daily life of slavery in States where comfort for the whites is an exception and not the rule. He shows us the barc, comfortless farm-houses, the meaner log-cabins, and lastly the sordid pens unworthy even the name of cabins, where thousands of poor whites drag out a degraded, comfortless, aimless existence, borne down by the weight of that system which enriches now and then a planter. The book is very thorough and accurate in its details, and is written in a style so lively and with so much dramatic incident as to hold the attention like a work of fiction. A friend of ours, a gentleman of high literary culture, confessed to having been beguiled to sitting more than the first half of the night to read it. Every Northern voter, and particularly every Northern farmer, ought to read this book and see what sort of a system this is to be spread over all our free territories. They will appreciate then, as they never did before, the worth of the struggle in Kansas. Certainly one must acknowledge, on reading it, that if slavery be the means of reclaiming the negro from heathenism, it certainly makes heathen ground of Christian countries.

In regard to fictitious anti-slavery writing, its career has carried a knowledge of American peculiarities, manners and customs throughout all Europe. The use of the novel in the great question of moral life is coming to be one of the features of the age. Formerly, the only object of fictitious writing was to amuse. Now, nothing is more common than to hear the inquiry of a work of fiction, "What is it intended to show or to prove?" A novel now is understood to be a parable—a story told in illustration of a truth or fact. One of the latest and best-issued of this kind is the story entitled "Caste," attributed, and we think with very good reason, to the author of "Ida May." In many respects Caste is the superior book. It is more carefully written and more positively religious in its effects on the mind. It is particularly valuable for the judicious and sensible views which it offers to people of colour in their attempt to free themselves from the thraldom of *caste*. Some of its delineations of Christian character are of a kind deeply to affect the heart. It is much better worthy an extensive circulation —much better calculated to do good than many works which have obtained a very wide sale. And those who are looking for the means of amusing a vacant hour in a manner which shall be at the same time profitable and instructive, had better put this book on their memorandum.—*Harriet Beecher Stowe, in The Independent.*

A PARABLE ILLUSTRATED.

We know (says a writer in the *Daily News*) that Miss Nightingale has been silent on dogmatic concerns, while eloquent on "the weightier matters of the law—justice, mercy and faith." Knowing that the needed work could be done by earnest disciples of every creed, and could not be got done if the disciples fell out by the way, she has been silent with the tongue while eloquent in good works. She has attended on all ministrations where her presence was desired, and did not interfere with a more pressing duty. She has procured Catholic books for the Romanist, Calvinistic books for the Independent, Church books for the Churchman; and she has indeed so managed that every sufferer desiring religious consolation has had the Gospel administered to him in the tongue in which he was born—brought to him in the form of household association and familiar comfort—without a taint of proselytism to distress him in his hour of weakness. And shall we not follow the example which we see to have succeeded so well? Shall we not use, in our far easier task, the methods by which she has, while healing the sick, awed the profane, strengthened the weak and impatient, and brought back many a sinner to the better mind of his youth?

Her example might be a sufficient lesson to us to unite in the great work of helping her without introducing any topic or discussion; but we are tempted to cite a parable bearing on the case—a parable which the elderly generation may have been reminded occasionally of since Florence Nightingale sailed for the East, but which is hardly sufficiently known to the young, and is by no means out of date for any of us. In "Evenings at Home" there is a story of Dr. Aikin's, the conclusion of which we cannot resist quoting. A Sunday morning in a town is described with its chiming bells, its trains of worshippers entering the churches and every kind of chapel—Romanist, Quaker, Methodist and Baptist. Then, when the bells have ceased, there follow the solemn organ and the murmur of the responses in one place; while elsewhere there are the slow psalm, the single voice in prayer, the tinkling of the little bell here, and the Quaker silence there. A boy who asks his father why these worshippers thus part off, is told that "Religion is one of the things in which men are *made to differ*." But next: "The several congregations now began to be dismissed, and the street was again overspread with persons of all the different sects, going promiscuously to their respective homes. It chanced that a poor man fell down in the street in a fit of apoplexy, and lay for dead. His wife and children stood round him crying and lamenting in the bitterest distress. The beholders immediately flocked round, and, with looks and expressions of the warmest compassion, gave their help. A Churchman raised the man from the ground by lifting him under the arms, while a Dissenter held his head, and wiped his face with a handkerchief. A Roman Catholic lady took out her smelling-bottle, and assiduously applied it to his nose. A Methodist ran for a doctor. A Quaker supported and comforted the woman; and a Baptist took care of the children. Edwin and his father were among the spectators. 'Here,' said the father, 'is a thing in which mankind were *made to agree*.'"

This is a simple story; but we are not yet too wise for it. Hands are yet held back from a pressing work of mercy by questions about the differences of faith. Let not the sick perish while we are scuffling for precedence for some sect or dogma, or lending an ear to the slander that Miss Nightingale is doing so. It is not true; and her work should be kept pure from the remotest taint of the *odium theologicum*, which is quite mischievous enough elsewhere.

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

Mary Howitt, in the *Athenæum*, states that she has received information from a Swedish gentleman, Mr. Chas. E. Södling, living in Brazil, that would lead to the supposition of there being traces of ancient Scandinavians in South America, before the days of Columbus, and the Spanish and Portuguese invaders.

——A CURIOUS QUESTION.—I recollect, moreover, standing in company with a native of Dorset, before a painting, admiring, as I gazed, the shrewd eye of "a Monk of the olden time," when I was forcibly struck with the striking likeness of my friend at my elbow to the Monk on the canvass. "In your neighbourhood," I asked, "was there a monastery?" "Yes," he answered, "near where I was born."

——A VETERAN BUFFOON.—On the 3d, died at Constantinople a certain mussahib (imperial buffoon), named Said Effendi, at the age of 121 years and 7 months. He had served four sultans as jester, and, notwithstanding his advanced age, the venerable old gentleman was often called up by the present sovereign, and ordered to say witty things and to perform antics, which latter he generally did with remarkable agility.

——PRIESTLY WIT.—A midshipman asked a priest to tell the difference between a priest and a jackass. The priest gave it up. "One wears a cross on his back and t'other on his breast," said the midshipman. "Now," said the priest, "tell me the difference between a midshipman and a jackass." The midshipman gave it up, and asked what it was? The priest said he knew of no difference whatever.

——At a recent general *reunion* of French *savans* at the house of M. Leverrier, much interest was occ